THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTIMACY AND MARITAL QUALITY IN CHILDLESS COUPLES

By

ANDRES NAZARIO, JR.

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1983

"Pues dígote, que cada cual se apea del caballo por donde le da la gana"

Musiño
(Zaza del Medio)

Esta investigación marca la culminación de mi entrenamiento académico formal. Mis aspiraciones tienen sus raíces en Zaza del Medio, y a través de los años se vieron tronchadas primero, modificadas después, pero han llegado a su meta.

Con honor, cariño y admiración dedico este proyecto a mis padres Andrés Nazario Sargen y Olga Torrens de Nazario porque fueron ellos los que sembraron estas aspiraciones y continuaron cultivándolas con su apoyo. Mi hermana Olga Nazario es en gran parte responsable de que me encaminara hacia la psicología. Cuando en una época me vi buscando nuevas direcciones, ella me sirvió de guía y de ejemplo, y ha continuado siéndolo a través de mi carrera. A Olgui con cariño dedico también esta disertación. Y finalmente, pero igualmente importante, dedico mis esfuerzos a mi familia toda, presentes y ausentes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of the members of my committee for their support. Special thanks are due to Dr. Ellen Amatea, chairperson, for her guidance in this project, and to Dr. Stephen Olejnik for his assistance with the data analyses. Dr. Harry Grater and Dr. Paul Schauble both provided important comments and suggestions. I also want to express my gratitude to Dr. Jim Archer for his availability the several times I needed him.

Thanks are also due to all of those friends and colleagues who helped me in the collection of data. I want to acknowledge the help of Jo Adams, Yvonne Benz, Sharen Bradley, Barbara Clark, Maria Antonieta García, Alice Martin, and Herb Steier. Jack Clark provided me with very valuable help in understanding the computer work. I also want to thank all those couples who participated in this study; without them this project would not have been possible.

There have been some very important influences on my professional development that I want to acknowledge. The Dade County Department of Youth and Family Development provided me with very valuable learning opportunities, and specifically I want to thank Mrs. Maria Allen and Mr. Miguel Reyes for their

support and encouragement and Dr. Dan Fairchild for his clinical guidance. I owe a great deal of my family training to DCDYFD.

This project is a study on intimacy; therefore I want to thank and acknowledge the contribution of my very special intimate friends Bruce Moore, Erika Futernick, and Robert Vinas. Much of what I know experientially about intimacy I learned from my friendship with each one of them. I value and cherish each for their participation in my life.

Finally, it gives me great satisfaction to acknowledge Jim Watson for his love, patience, encouragement and support. Jim has been a true hero throughout this, at times painful, process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTIMACY AND MARITAL QUALITY IN CHILDLESS COUPLES

By

Andres Nazario, Jr.

December 1983

Chairperson: Ellen S. Amatea
Major Department: Counselor Education

Eighty-five childless couples completed the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS), the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships inventory (PAIR), and a demographic questionnaire. The dependent variable for this study was the DAS rating of marital quality. The independent variables were generated from eleven different scores on the PAIR inventory. The PAIR yielded perceived and expected scores in the areas of emotional intimacy, social intimacy, sexual intimacy, intellectual intimacy, and recreational intimacy, as well as a score on conventionality.

Results from this study revealed significant and strong relationships for both males and females between each of the five perceived intimacy variables and marital quality, and between conventionality and marital quality. Significant relationships were also found between marital quality and expected intellectual

and expected recreational intimacy for males, and between marital quality and expected emotional intimacy, expected sexual intimacy, expected intellectual intimacy, and expected recreational intimacy for females. Differences between perceptions and expectations in all five areas of intimacy were significantly related to marital quality for both males and females.

Six regression analyses were computed separately for males and for females to assess the combined impact of several clusters of intimacy variables in predicting marital quality scores. The most powerful and parsimonious regression model for females was composed of perceived emotional intimacy, perceived recreational intimacy, and conventionality, accounting for 80% of the variance in female's marital quality scores. In contrast, the most powerful predictive model for males included perceived emotional intimacy, perceived social intimacy, expected social intimacy, expected intellectual intimacy, and perceived recreational intimacy and accounted for 77% of the variance in male's marital quality scores.

It was concluded that findings from this study support both theoretical and clinical notions postulating a relationship between marital quality and intimacy in childless couples. Both the importance of an absolute level of intimacy and the relative level of similarity between perceptions and expectations of intimacy seemed to be supported. It appears however that males and females have different perceptions and expectations of intimacy. Implications for future research are discussed.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Cultural and economic changes have brought about major shifts in the way marriage is viewed and practiced in this culture. Initially marriage was considered an imperative for survival and normalcy (Ramey, 1976). People got married for economic and procreational functions. With the impact of such events as the Industrial Revolution and World War II, marriage began to be viewed as a choice and couples began to decide which type of relationship they wanted. Although conventional marriage continues to be the most prevalent preference for marital union, other choices such as childless marriages, sexually open marriages, cohabitation, and choosing not to marry are gaining acceptance in this culture (Ramey, 1976).

There appear to be many reasons which motivate individuals to seek the married state. In our culture love seems to be a prominent one (Cox, 1978). At the present time most Americans marry or enter primary relationships in an attempt to find companionship, caring, love, and intimacy. Both our culture and social structure place tremendous expectations on marriage. Needs that were once satisfied by the family of origin (nuclear and extended), neighborhood friends, and community contacts are now, for the most part, expected to be fulfilled by a spouse. Economic and

procreational functions are no longer sufficient; marriage is to provide love and companionship. Marital theorists now contend that it is primarily the way in which expectations for love and companionship are met that tends to keep two individuals married to each other (Lewis & Spanier, 1979). Therefore expectations regarding marital intimacy appear to be important dimensions of the marital experience.

Scope of the Problem

As ideas about the goals of marriage have evolved from those of attempting to satisfy concrete tangible needs to the more abstract levels of attempting to satisfy feelings and expectations, the researcher's focus of analysis has shifted as well. Although researchers have studied the variables involved in successful marital life since the early thirties (Burgess & Cottrell, 1939; Terman, 1938), most of these early studies investigated the impact of external variables such as age, occupation, and income level on marriage (O'Brien, 1976). As expectations about marriage began to change, changes occurred in the way the marital relationship was conceptualized and investigated. This transition began in the early fifties. In 1951 Locke began to study the individual's adjustment to the marital relationship. During this stage the primary focus of investigation was the performance of one's functions within the institution of marriage (Eshleman & Clarke, 1978). At this time, successful marriages were judged to be those in which both spouses were cognizant of their individual roles and performed them

adequately (Cox, 1978). Furthermore, studies of marriage at this time relied heavily on wives' responses to the marital institution. Very few studies attempted to involve husbands in the research samples (Hicks & Platt, 1970).

The sixties--with their emphasis on human potential, the expression of feelings and growth, and the endorsement of alternative lifestyles--brought new dimensions to marital life and to the study of marriages (Schaefer & Olson, 1981). Parallel changes were occurring in marital relations and in the manner of investigating such relationships. People choosing to get married were viewed as seeking to satisfy personal needs such as companionship and intimacy within a primary relationship or marriage. Researchers investigating marriages moved from studying the institution of marriage and began to focus on the quality of the marital relationship (Spanier & Lewis, 1980). These studies began to focus on the couple rather than just the individual's report of adjustment to the marriage and examined variables such as the presence or absence of problems in areas such as conflict-resolution and role conflict (Hicks & Platt, 1970). Researchers also began to concern themselves with evaluating some of the skills associated with marital quality such as instrumental and affective communication, self-disclosure, and sexual fulfillment (Hatfield, 1982; Horowitz, 1977; Simms, 1978).

In more recent years marital quality has been conceptualized as a multidimensional construct. Spanier and Lewis (1980) identified marital communication, satisfaction,

happiness, and adjustment as some of the variables used as indices of marital quality. Gottman (1979) described these variables as components of one global variable. Spanier and Lewis (1980), in their review of the marital literature of the seventies, identified a trend towards the synthesis of literature and the building of theories around multidimensional concepts that encompass the totality of marital quality. Spanier (1976) defined marital quality as a multidimensional concept, a process that focuses on several dyadic accommodations to the marriage and takes into consideration the affective involvement of the individual.

The seventies have also been a time when researchers have focused more upon examining the relationship between marital quality and the developmental stages of the couple or family (Spanier & Lewis, 1980). For example, several researchers have reported a decrease in couples' interaction with the arrival of the first child and a decrease in reported marital quality (Houseknecht, 1979; Ryder, 1973). Burr (1970) stated that after the arrival of the first child, an increase in reported marital quality does not occur until the last child has left home.

Another recent trend in the field of marital quality research, noted by Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers (1976), is that of examining the subjective experience of individuals in the marital relationship. These authors state that the assessment of personal characteristics such as income level, age, and education account for very little of the variance in

marital quality. The subjective evaluation of the individual, on the other hand, is a very powerful predictor. Campbell and his associates contend that marital quality, or the quality of any domain of life experience,"is produced by the difference between an individual's preceived reality of the current situation and his or her aspiration concerning the domain" (Rhyne, 1981, p. 942). Thus Blishen and his associates (1975) contend that it is the amount of discrepancy between what the individual gets out of a relationship and what he/she would like to get out of the relationship which accounts for reported marital quality. Therefore since a common marital expectation is that it will fulfill an individual's needs for intimacy, it is important to examine the subjective experience of intimacy in marital relationships.

Intimacy is not a thing; it is a process; and several areas of intimacy have been identified (Clinebell & Clinebell, 1971; Dahms, 1972; Schaefer & Olson, 1981). Schaefer and Olson have described five types of intimacy: sexual, emotional, recreational, intellectual, and social which they hypothesize are related to marital quality. Although there seems to be some consensus among writers that intimacy is related to marital quality, there seems to be some disagreement over whether it is the absolute level of attained marital intimacy or the degree of similarity between spouses in needs for intimacy which accounts for marital quality. Several authors propose that couples who experience high levels of marital quality will also experience high levels

of intimacy (Clinebell & Clinebell, 1971; Schaefer & Olson, 1981). Other writers theorize that couples who experience high levels of marital quality most likely experience very similar needs for intimacy and therefore it is the similarity in subjective experiences of intimacy that accounts for high levels of marital quality (Campbell et al., 1976; Rhyne, 1981).

The significance of intimacy in marital relationships has been addressed by several writers. Rhyne (1981) states that "marriage in today's society has the function of providing a critical sociopsychological support system for people" (p. 942). In a similar vein, Whitaker (1982) states that in our culture marriage allows for closeness and communion with one other person. He defines marriage as "an adult model of intimacy" (p. 167). Schaefer and Olson (1981) present the same idea in a slightly different manner. They state that intimacy is highly valued by Americans today and accounts for a major reason for getting married. These views of today's marital relationships lead to the assumption that the ideal marital relationship is characterized by a state of intimacy. Yet, although a relationship between marital quality and intimacy has been postulated by theorists and clinicians, it had not been empirically validated.

Furthermore, marriage and family clinicians seem to indicate that marriage is not made in heaven; that individuals seek each other based on a number of dimensions that complement each other. Ackerman (1958) states that despite

a lack of scientific data there is reason to believe that the choice of a mate is a purposeful act merging several motives. Similarly, "Whitaker believes that the choice of a partner for marriage is invariably done with wisdom and purpose" (Neill & Kniskern, 1982, p. 323). Thus individuals choose a mate who is at their same level of differentiation (Bowen, 1976). Differentiation means that individuals marry those who are at their same level of emotional functioning. Martin (1976) supports this concept from a clinical viewpoint stating that individuals become a couple if they are "matched" in their levels and degrees of intimacy. Thus it suggests not the importance of attaining an absolute level of intimacy in marriage, but the significance of the relative level between husband and wife. Despite the prevalence of these concepts, the lack of empirical validation seems to suggest the importance of investigating the relationship between marital quality and intimacy.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between marital quality and intimacy in childless couples. Specifically, the study sought to investigate if there were differences between males and females in their perceptions and expectations of intimacy. Furthermore the study attempted to determine the amount of variance specific intimacy variables shared with marital quality.

Need for the Study

Although the relationship between intimacy and marital quality has been identified by theorists and clinicians, no empirical validation for such relationship existed. There was thus a need to investigate the relationship between intimacy and marital quality and to ascertain if there were specific areas of intimacy that were more critical than others in the development and maintenance of high quality marital relationships. Moreover, there was a need to know if the critical aspect was the amount of intimacy perceived by the individual, or the couple; or whether it was the discrepancy between the perceived and expected levels of intimacy that accounted for marital quality. Furthermore, there was a need to include both husbands and wives in order to assess their subjective experience of the marital relationship. These needs for investigation formed the backdrop for this research study.

Significance of the Study

There are several implications that derive from this study which are of significance to the general public and to marriage and family life educators, practitioners, and researchers.

First, this investigation has demonstrated that a relationship exists between marital quality and intimacy; therefore theoretical formulations that were based on clinical observations until the present time have been strengthened by this empirical validation. This can allow for more

specific delineations of theories and suggests the need for future experimental study of the relationship between marital quality and intimacy to further investigate causal factors. Secondly, since specific areas of intimacy have been identified as critically related to marital quality, both educators and practitioners in the area of marriage and the family can utilize this new information both in the development of appropriate programs that emphasize the acquisition of such behaviors and in helping distressed couples in a more efficient manner by focusing on those specific critical areas of intimacy. Finally, findings from this study suggest that pre-marital counseling focused on exploration and or acquisition of intimacy skills may lead to better and longer lasting marital relationships.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of clarity, definitions of the following terms are provided:

1. Couple: A unit composed of a man and a woman legally married to each other, or living together for more than one year.
2. Marital Quality: A multidimensional concept that encompasses the variables of marital satisfaction, marital adjustment, and marital happiness.
3. Marital Quality Operationalized: The scores obtained by individuals on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976).

4. Intimacy: A concept developed by Schaefer and Olson (1981) to indicate a process between two individuals sharing personal experiences in five specific areas, and that involves time and commitment. These areas are
   a) Emotional intimacy: The area of intimacy that involves experiencing and sharing closeness of feelings between two individuals.
   b) Social intimacy: The area of intimacy characterized by the experience of having common friends and similarities in social networks.
   c) Sexual intimacy: It is identified as those experiences of sharing general physical affection and/or sexual activities.
   d) Intellectual intimacy: The experience of sharing ideas between two individuals.
   e) Recreational intimacy: The area of intimacy characterized by shared experiences of interests in hobbies and/or mutual participation in sporting events.
5. Intimacy Operationalized: The scores obtained by individuals on the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (Schaefer & Olson, 1981). There are two types of scores obtained in each of the five identified areas:
   a) Perceived or realized intimacy: The score obtained on the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships that ascertains the degree to which the

individual partner in a relationship presently feels intimate in each of the five areas of intimacy.

b) Ideal or expected intimacy: The score obtained on the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships that ascertains the degree to which the individual partner in a relationship would like to be intimate in each of the five areas of intimacy.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter two contains a review of the related literature. Topics covered in this chapter include a review of theories and research on marital quality and on intimacy. A discussion of the research methodology and data collection analyses is presented in chapter three. Chapter four contains the results of the study including a description of the study-sample. Finally, discussion of the results, conclusions, and recommendations based on the findings appear in chapter five.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter conceptual models of marital quality are discussed along with a rationale for the selection of both a specific definition of marital quality and a method of assessment. In addition, those psychological theories which offer support for the significance of intimacy in human development are discussed and their relationship to marital quality established. Finally, literature describing the impact of children on marital intimacy is reviewed.

Marital Quality: Theory and Research

The concept of marital quality has been described neither clearly nor consistently in the literature. Different terms have been employed to assess or describe the concept of marital quality (e.g., marital success, marital happiness, marital integration, marital satisfaction, marital adjustment). The same term has also been used by different authors to describe very different concepts (e.g., marital quality has been used to describe marital satisfaction and to describe marital adjustment). Thus, depending on the writer, the concepts of marital happiness, marital success, marital satisfaction, and marital adjustment have been described both as interchangeable and as very different constructs. Horowitz (1977) states that "none of these terms have been defined in a manner which facilitates comparisons among

findings of different researchers" (p. 7). In this section different research findings on marital quality are reviewed. Evidence supporting the integration of these various concepts into one global variable are presented, and the concept of marital quality is defined as it is used in this study. Finally measures of marital adjustment and criticisms relating to their use are discussed.

Researchers have been studying the variables involved in marriage since the early thirties (Burgess & Cottrell, 1939; Terman, 1938). Initially, these studies involved the external variables of marriage (O'Brien, 1976). Young, after reviewing the marital satisfaction literature, states that "prior to the last decade, research on marital satisfaction usually focused on demographic factors" (Young, 1982, p. 10). In their review of the marital literature of the sixties, Hicks and Platt (1970) identified demographic variables such as age, occupation, education, income, socioeconomic similarities, and religion, as comprising the variables most often studied in relation to marital relationships.

More recently, marital quality has been the primary focus of study in the field of marital studies (Spanier, 1976). Some of the topics of interest in marital research during the seventies were marital quality and extramarital relationships, premarital sexual chastity and postmarital adjustment, effects of cohabitation on marital success, social networks and marriage, remarriage and marital quality, marital power and marital happiness (Spanier & Lewis, 1980).

Are marital adjustment, marital satisfaction, and marital happiness synonymous? In looking at these different constructs, one can become confused as to whether they are highly related variables or components of one global variable. Several writers contend that marital satisfaction, happiness, and adjustment are all dimensions of one global variable. Gottman (1979) states that a high correlation between these variables attests to their comprising one global variable. Young (1982) states that "one consistent problem in marital research is that . . . while researchers talk about marital 'happiness,' there is little consensus on what happiness is, let alone how it would be measured . . . [thus] research in marital satisfaction, happiness, and adjustment is all considered to be tapping into one global variable" (p. 9-10).

Many factors have been associated with marital quality. Spanier and Lewis (1980) identify communication, satisfaction, happiness, and adjustment as some of the factors recently studied pertaining to marital quality.

Marital communication, for example, has been the subject of numerous studies. Lee (1980) states that "good marital communication involves the husband and wife expressing themselves in ways that effectively get through to the other person . . ." (p. 16). Strauss (1974) studying couples identified as happily married found that these couples communicate in an honest, clear, mature manner. On the other hand, Lee (1980) found no significant differences between high and

low scoring groups on a marital adjustment scale when examined against the same communication variables. Other researchers have studied the relationship between marital communication and conflict-resolution (Bellings, 1979; Epstein and Santa-Barbara, 1975). Marital satisfaction has been related to caring (Lee, 1980), to sexual satisfaction (Horowitz, 1977), and to sex roles (Simms, 1978). Happiness in marriage has been studied as it relates to families of origin (Gottman, 1979) and role conflict (Navran, 1967; Levinger, 1964). Adjustment in marriage has been investigated as it relates to conventionality (Edmonds et al., 1972), perceived similarity (Kotlar, 1965), and accuracy in predicting partners' response (Taylor, 1967).

In reviewing these studies, one can conclude that they each seem to focus on a different aspect of the total variable of marital quality. These conclusions support Gottman's (1979) and Young's (1982) statement that such outcomes are tapping into one global variable. Therefore there is a need to examine what is meant by the construct in various research studies.

Competing Definitions of Marital Quality

Even though there is some consensus among marriage and family researchers that one global variable is being tapped in marital research studies, different writers have selected different terms to describe the variable of marital quality.

In their review of the marital quality research of the seventies, Spanier and Lewis (1980) stated that the trend in

marital studies has been towards "attempts to build theory and synthesize the literature" (p. 96). Several theories have emerged all relating to marital quality, although different theorists have selected different terms as the concept around which to develop their theories. Perhaps the two most influential of these theories are the one developed by Burr (1973) and Burr and associates (1979) and the one developed by Spanier and Cole (1976) and Spanier (1976, 1979).

Burr (1973) and Burr and associates (1979) have built a theory of marital quality around the concept of marital satisfaction. They define marital satisfaction "as the 'subjectively experienced reaction' to one's marriage, as opposed to marital satisfaction as the 'amount' of congruence between the expectations a person has and the rewards the person actually receives" (Spanier & Lewis, 1980, p. 103). This definition has been criticized by Spanier and Lewis (1980) as being intrapersonal in nature, rather than interpersonal.

On the other hand, Spanier and Cole (1976) and Spanier (1976) have selected what they term "the multidimensional ... concept of marital adjustment" for their theory of marital quality. Spanier refers to "dyadic adjustment" (since the term applies to non-marital couples as well) "as a process, the outcome of which is determined by the degree of (1) troublesome dyadic differences; (2) interpersonal tensions and personal anxiety; (3) dyadic satisfaction; (4) dyadic

cohesion; and (5) consensus on matters of importance to dyadic functioning" (Spanier, 1976, p. 17). This definition has led to an operationalization of the concept of marital adjustment and the development of an instrument to assess marital quality. Although defined as a process, this definition of marital quality allows for a qualitative analysis of the marital relationship at a given point in time. This is what Spanier calls taking a "snapshot" of the quality of the relationship at a given time on a continuum of adjustment.

This study adhered to the concept developed by Spanier (1976) and selected marital adjustment as the most clear and precise definition of marital quality.

Measures of Marital Quality

In adopting Spanier's definition and approach to measuring marital quality, it is necessary to consider the alternative instruments employed and problems in measuring marital quality.

Historically, the assessment of marital quality has suffered from the lack of a comprehensive multidimensional measure which would allow for the simultaneous assessment of a broad range of dimensions in the marital relationship as they relate to global marital adjustment (Snyder, 1979).

Early measures of marital quality were characterized by "general investigation of marriage not focusing on a particular area or dimension of marital interaction" (Snyder, 1979, p. 818). These measures emphasized the identification of sociodemographic variables as correlates of marital quality

(e.g., Burgess and Wallin, 1953; Hamilton, 1929; Terman, 1938). Later on, Locke (1951) defined marital adjustment as "accommodation of a husband and wife to each other at a given time" (p. 251). Locke developed a 50-item inventory, The Locke Marital Adjustment Test, to measure this concept. Locke and Wallace (1959), selecting the most basic or fundamental items of existing marital inventories, developed the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test. This attempt resulted in a 15 item scale that became widely used by researchers in the field of marital studies. The Locke-Wallace became the most frequently used scale for assessing marital quality (Snyder, 1979; Spanier, 1976).

Although the most frequently used test of marital quality, the Locke-Wallace has been criticized by several investigators. Hawkins (1966) and Edmonds and associates (1972) have been critical of the tendency of the Locke-Wallace to be "heavily contaminated by subjects' tendencies to distort the appraisal of their marriages in the direction of social desirability" (Snyder, 1979, p. 820). Spanier (1972) indicated that many studies employing the Locke-Wallace report marital adjustment for the couple when in reality scores are reflecting "only the marital adjustment of the wife" (p. 403). Spanier not only criticized the Locke-Wallace "on the basis of relatively low correlations between husband and wife marital adjustment scores," but also suggested that Locke-Wallace "and most other marital measures assess not the marital relationship itself, but rather

individual adjustment to that relationship" (Snyder, 1979, p. 820). Other measures of marital quality have suffered from inadequate demonstration and reporting of reliability (Adams, 1960; Inselberg, 1964; Katz, 1965; Manson & Lerner, 1962).

One serious weakness of marital quality assessments has been the unidimensional approach most often employed. As previously discussed, Gottman (1979) suggested that these dimensions are all components of a global variable. Spanier (1976) selected the term "marital adjustment" as the global variable that encompasses marital quality. He also developed an inventory, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) for assessing the quality of marriage or any dyadic relationship. The DAS involves four empirically verified components that can also be used as sub-scales: dyadic satisfaction, dyadic cohesion, dyadic consensus, and affectional expression.

The DAS has been selected for this study both because its components have been empirically verified, and because of its ability to take a "snapshot" of an ongoing relationship at a given time. Chapter III discusses the development of this inventory along with evidence for its validity and reliability.

Intimacy: Theory and Research

The term intimacy has been used rather loosely throughout the years by philosophers, poets, novelists, and social scientists. Historically, it has been a term usually employed in a vague manner allowing for different meanings at

different times. As Levenson (1974) stated: "Intimacy is a venerable word with a long history of changing meaning" (p. 359).

The need for intimacy was recognized by the ancient Greeks. Both Plato and Aristotle referred to its significance in love and friendships. Theologians emphasized the importance of an intimate relationship between the individual and God. In romantic literature, the hero and heroine always sought each other and struggled to be together to become intimate. Even popular songs and T.V. commercials have "cashed in" on the significance of intimacy in human relations.

Yet, for the social scientist, intimacy has become important only recently. Although intimacy has appeared in the theorizing of many personality and developmental theorists, and has been identified as an important human need, it became a significant area of research only in the early seventies (Sexton & Sexton, 1982).

Intimacy and Personality Development

Psychological theorists of both analytic and humanistic persuasions have emphasized the significance of intimacy in the development of the individual. Maslow (1968) viewed intimacy as a vital ingredient in his hierarchy of needs. Erickson (1963) described the capacity for intimacy as an essential component for functional adjustment. For Sullivan (1953) intimacy involved the most important aspect of the capacity for positive mental health and the development of

maturity. Fromm (1947), in discussing the need for relatedness, identified intimacy as an essential for productive love. Angyal expressed the need for intimacy when he stated that "to be . . . is to mean something to someone else" (Angyal, 1965, p. 78). Angyal "continues to outline the need to be 'needed' in an intimate relationship as a fundamental precept to his theory" (Schaefer & Olson, 1981, p. 48). Dahms (1972) views intimacy as an "overlooked requirement for survival" (p. 1). Striving for intimacy is rooted in the most fundamental needs of the human organism. In infancy, to be held, touched, comforted, and nourished is mandatory for survival (Lee, 1980). In adults, the desire for intimacy is a major motivation for entering and maintaining a marital relationship (Feldman, 1979). Thus, "although there is much disagreement about the essential meaning of the term, there seems to be a consensus that intimacy, whatever it may be, is of central importance in human relationships . . . " (Fisher & Stricker, 1982, p. xi).

In reviewing these theories, it appeared that the development and maintenance of intimate relationships are crucial for the adjustment of the individual. Furthermore, these theories appear to indicate that intimacy involves two individuals; that it is a reciprocal concept. Yet not all definitions of intimacy allude to this reciprocity. In the next section several definitions of the concept of intimacy are reviewed.

Conceptualizations of Intimacy

Conceptually, several approaches have been followed in defining intimacy. Some writers have viewed intimacy as an intrapsychic phenomenon. Others have viewed intimacy as interactive in nature. Others define intimacy as a process rather than an outcome. In discussing intimacy, Fisher and Stricker (1982) state that there have been two primary approaches to the conceptualization of intimacy. "One approach to intimacy focuses on an intrapsychic conception" (p. xi). From this viewpoint "intimacy occurs when an individual achieves full self-knowledge, and is fully in touch with his or her feelings and wishes" (p. xi). Therefore, an act of intimacy occurs when the individual is willing to share these feelings and wishes with another. Moreover, this definition does not imply reciprocity. The other approach to intimacy described by Fisher and Stricker stresses the interpersonal nature of the concept. "Intimacy is seen as the product of an interaction, and can only occur between people." From this interactive perspective, each individual "is able to touch something meaningful in the other, whether at a conscious, behavioral level or an unconscious and inferential level" (p. xi).

Mendelschn, defined intimacy as "a cognitive state that relates to knowledge of one's psychic reality" (Mendelsohn, 1982, p. 39). Although he viewed intimacy as an intrapsychic process, he stated that " . . . one's emotional attitude towards this knowledge is the affective component of

intimacy" (p. 39). Therefore, intimacy is defined as an interpersonal process as well.

Existential writers have also been concerned with the concept of intimacy. Denes (1982) defined intimacy as "an intentional action between like creatures whose will it is to bridge the echoless silence of the universe. Intimacy is a self-transcendent act of faith based on courage and trust" (p. 136). Mahrer (1982) viewed intimacy as a three-tiered concept. The first tier refers to "a particular kind of experiencing or feeling. . . . It is a bodily-grounded felt sense" (p. 141). The second tier refers "to a particular kind of relationship. It is a dual mode of relating in which two intact individuals risk a bit of their respective sense of self or I-ness" (p. 142). The third tier, which Mahrer describes as "the highest plateau of value," is considered "a state of fusion between two persons. There is a blending, an assimilation, a cojoining integration of two persons" (p. 142).

Ladner (1982) provides yet another definition of intimacy: "Intimacy is a special quality of emotional closeness that binds two people to one another. It may be described as an affectionate tie composed of trust, mutual respect and caring, and open sharing of feelings, experiences, love, and sexual expression of that relatedness" (p. 219). In contrast, Hatfield, Utne, and Traupmann (1979) define intimacy as a static concept, stating that intimates are individuals whose love for each other made their lives deeply entwined. In a

more recent article, Hatfield (1982) describes intimacy not as a static concept but as a process. She defines intimacy "as a process by which a dyad--in expression of thought, affect, and behavior--attempts to move more towards complete communication on all levels" (p. 271).

Clinebell and Clinebell (1971) define intimacy as a multifaceted concept. These authors state that intimacy is the satisfaction of a mutual need in the following areas: sexual, emotional, spiritual, communication, creative, recreational, aesthetic, crisis conflict, commitment, and work. Similarly, Dahms (1972) defines intimacy as a closeness of one individual to another on three specific levels: intellectual, physical, and emotional. Recognizing the works of the Clinebells and Dahms as the most extensive and refined conceptual definitions of intimacy, Schaefer and Olson (1981) define intimacy as "a process that occurs over time and is never completed or fully accomplished . . . an intimate relationship is where an individual shares intimate experiences in several areas, and there is the expectation that the relationship will persist over time" (p. 50). Five areas of intimacy are defined and described by Schaefer and Olson: emotional, social, intellectual, sexual, and recreational. Since, according to Schaefer and Olson intimacy is viewed as occurring in different areas, a person's relationships can be described not just as intimate or non-intimate, but rather, in terms of specific behaviors. Given this advantage Schaefer and Olson's definition appeared the most functional for use in this study.

The Assessment of Intimacy

Although conceptualizations of the role of intimacy in human development have a time-honored tradition, it is only recently that the investigation and assessment of intimacy has emerged as a viable field of study. Moreover, attempts to operationally define intimacy and thus measure this concept have been plagued with contradictions.

Schaefer and Olson (1981) in their review of the literature on intimacy found that many writers use the terms self-disclosure and intimacy interchangeably (e.g., Altman & Taylor, 1973; Huesmann & Levinger, 1976; Jourard, 1964). Schaefer and Olson (1981) describe the differences between self-disclosure and intimacy. They state "past operational measures of intimacy have been either too global, such as marital satisfaction measures, or have measured closely related . . . concepts, such as . . . self-disclosure" (p. 51). Two critical elements are identified by Schaefer and Olson as separating intimacy from self-disclosure: time and commitment. Intimacy occurs over time, and there is the expectation of commitment in the relationship. On the other hand, self-disclosure may occur between strangers and in casual encounters (Hatfield, 1982). According to Schaefer and Olson (1981) self-disclosure scales attempt to measure the individual willingness to disclose intimate feelings, although they "do not indicate the kind, character, or frequency of intimacy experienced in the relationship" (p. 51). Hatfield (1982) suggests that too much self-disclosure

may be detrimental to one's relationships. Similarly, Schaefer and Olson (1981) suggest a curvilinear relationship between self-disclosure and intimacy. They state "that self-disclosure is a necessary ingredient in the development of intimacy, but that given the setting, too much self-disclosure can be counter-productive" (p. 56). Therefore, Schaefer and Olson (1981) provide an operational definition of intimacy as "a process and an experience which is the outcome of the disclosure of intimate topics and sharing of intimate experiences" (p. 51). To assess the degree of intimacy that individuals perceive in their relationships with others, these authors have developed an inventory, The Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (PAIR), that measures expected versus realized degrees of intimacy in five areas.

Research on Intimacy and Marital Quality

The definition of intimacy postulated by Schaefer and Olson implies that a relationship exist between intimacy and marital adjustment. In fact, many theorists and clinicians contend that there is a link between intimacy and marital quality.

Although the construct of intimacy has been linked to marital quality, little empirical verification of this relationship had been conducted. There was a need to examine if in fact such a relationship existed.

Common sense seems to indicate that intimacy is a prerequisite for the smoother functioning of any "intimate

relationship." In our culture, most people get married to seek and maintain intimacy (Schaefer and Olson, 1981). Marriage has evolved from providing an outlet for sexual expression, the procreation of the family, and fulfilling economic functions to fulfilling the needs for intimacy, sex, and companionship (Ramey, 1976). Tremendous expectations have been placed on marriage today. Most people want marriages that fill their needs; and although many needs can be met outside of a primary relationship, the need for love and commitment can not be met in any casual connection. They require the involvement in an intimate relationship (Sager and Hunt, 1979).

"In general, the more satisfied people are with such characteristics as love and affection, friendship, interest, sexual gratification, the more satisfied they are with their marriage as a whole" (Rhyne, 1981, p. 942). Moreover, Schaefer and Olson (1981) hypothesize that couples who in general receive high scores on marital adjustment scales, should also have rather high scores on an intimacy scale. These statements as well as numerous marital enrichment programs, books, and articles (e.g., Cox, 1978; Davis, 1973; Eshleman & Clarke, 1978; Levinger & Raush, 1977; Ramey, 1976; Sager & Hunt, 1979; Shor & Sanville, 1978) emphasize the need for intimacy in marital or dyadic relationships. It must then be assumed that there is a substantial relationship between levels of intimacy and marital or dyadic adjustment. Yet, the existing evidence appeared to be clinically rather

than empirically based. Professionals involved in doing marital therapy frequently testify to the move in therapy couples make from a position of non-intimacy to greater intimate contact. Hoffman (1981) discussing family therapy described the denial of intimacy between spouses as a typical covert conflict which manifests itself as a family symptom. On the other hand, Farson (1977) stated that sometimes good marriages fail because marriage counseling "has further burdened our marriages by asking us to live up to what we know to be our best" (p. 253). Thus individuals strive to achieve higher levels of intimacy in their relationships which may create disparity between husbands and wives, because mass education, the media, and psychotherapists endorse and even promote higher expectations from marriage (Farson, 1977).

This emphasis on higher levels of intimacy in marital relationships is a modern cultural phenomenon. DeBurger (1977) stated that "marriages which today do not provide a sufficient level and range of closeness or intimacy between the partners are likely to be perceived as deficient, as seriously lacking the prime ingredients necessary for sustaining a vital, satisfying relationship" (p. 234). Frankel (1982) similarly stated that intimacy in marital relationships is sought and valued as a modern marital expectation, while Grunebaum and Christ (1976) warn against conveying dogmatic assertions about "good" and "bad" intimacies under the guise of marital expertise.

There are some other notions postulated by theorists and clinicians alike that although acknowledging the significance of intimacy in marital relationships do not lend support to the striving for higher levels of intimacy. These theorists and clinicians emphasize the importance of the relative similarity in needs for intimacy between the individuals in a couple. Martin (1976) states that individuals that become a couple are matched in their levels and degrees of intimacy. Frankel (1982) discussing intimacy and marital adjustment alludes to the developmental similarities of the spouses comprising a couple. This is what Bowen (1976) has referred to when he states that individuals choose a mate who is at their same level of differentiation. Frankel (1982) states that if this were not true, "they would never marry in the first place, or would probably be divorced rather than seek marital therapy" (p. 250). Therefore it is important to establish whether the goals of marital therapy should be helping couples achieve higher levels of intimacy, or helping them to deal with their difficulties in intimacy at their similar stage of emotional development.

The clinical evidence of the relationship between marital quality and intimacy is abundant. Based on clinical evidence it can be assumed couples experiencing marital difficulties are also experiencing difficulties in some areas of intimacy or vice versa (no causality implied). Yet the tendency has been towards the encouragement of attaining higher levels of intimacy rather than the identification of a common

thermostat that would allow couples to regulate their own levels of comfort in the areas of intimacy. The need for a study that first empirically validates the clinical assumption that a relationship between intimacy and marital quality exists appeared evident. Furthermore, there was a need to identify whether higher levels of intimacy were better predictors of marital quality than relative levels of intimacy subjectively experienced by the couple at similar or close levels of emotional development. Finally, there was a need to identify if specific intimacy variables were related to marital quality, and if there were some areas of intimacy more critical than others.

Marital Quality and Intimacy in Childless Couples

As implied by the concept of adjustment on a continuum, couples can move back and forth on this maladjustment-adjustment continuum. There are some external variables that have been identified as influencing movement on this continuum. One of them, the presence or absence of children in the relationship seems to be of critical importance.

In their review of the sixties, Hicks and Platt (1970) reported the surprising conclusion that the presence of children detracts from the reported quality of marital relationship. Several studies since continue to report very similar findings. Spanier and Lewis (1980) reviewing the seventies corroborated the same findings at the same time that pointed out some specifications. They reported that "research in the past decade substantiates the fact that the

birth of a child has a negative impact upon most marriages, especially for wives" (p. 99). Ryder (1973) also compared a group of recently-turned-parents couples with a group of childless couples. Using the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test, the results point out to a decrease of marital adjustment with the arrival of the first child. Using a "Lovesickness" questionnaire, Ryder also found that "wives who had had children became significantly more likely than those in childless couples to report that their husbands were not paying enough attention to them" (Waldron & Routh, 1981, p. 785). This may point to a decrease in intimacy between husband and wife. Waldron and Routh (1981) replicating Ryder's (1973) study added a new dimension. They wanted to know if sex roles (androgynous, masculine, feminine) had any bearing on the marital quality of couples after the birth of their first child. Although no relationship was found between parental sex role and adjustment, the findings of negative impact on couples' marital quality were replicated. In another study, Glenn and McLanahan (1982) analyzed the data from six U.S. National Surveys conducted from 1973 through 1978. These investigators concluded that the presence of a child or children in the family adversely impacts on the parents' marital quality. Overall it appears that the decline in marital quality after the arrival of children is more prevalent among wives than husbands (Ryder, 1973; Spanier & Lewis, 1980). Considering the concept of choice, Houseknecht (1979) studied a group of childless by

choice women matched on several critical variables to a group of mothers. She found that "the women who were voluntarily childless exhibited higher marital adjustment than did the mothers" (Spanier & Lewis, 1980, p. 99).

There are some indications that this decrease in marital quality prevails throughout the parenting career of the couple and that marital quality increases again as the last child leaves home (Burr, 1970; Glenn, 1975). Research on the quality of marriage over the family life cycle is flawed however since marital researchers studying the relationship between marital quality and "stages" of the family life cycle have not utilized longitudinal studies (Spanier & Lewis, 1980).

Since the evidence points to a decrease in marital quality with the presence of a child or children, this research study was designed to examine levels of intimacy as related to marital quality in childless couples only.

Summary

In summary, the construct of intimacy has appeared with great regularity in both clinical and theoretical discussions of marriage and marital quality and seems to be an intrinsic part of modern Americans' expectations regarding marriage. Only limited research has been done to explore the manner in which perceptions and expectations of intimacy impact upon one's assessment of the quality of the marital

relationship. Thus, there appeared to be a need to determine in what ways perceptions and expectations of intimacy interact both individually and within the couple dyad to affect the quality of the marital relationship. Moreover, marriage and family clinicians theorize that individuals in a couple are matched in their capacity for intimacy. This clinical notion needed to be confirmed empirically. Finally, since research with couples with children indicated that many of these couples experience an erosion of intimacy due to demands of childrearing and thus present an additional confounding effect, only childless couples were examined in this study in order to clarify this relationship.

CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study examined the relationship between marital quality and intimacy in childless couples. Couples participating in this study had been married no less than one year and no longer than ten. The relationship between marital quality and intimacy was examined both for individual mates and for couples as a whole. Marital quality was assessed by means of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976). Intimacy was measured through use of the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (Schaefer & Olson, 1981).

This chapter is organized into the following sections of information: research design, hypotheses, subjects, procedures, criterion instruments, methods of data analyses, and limitations of the study.

Research Design

This study employed a correlational research design. Data were collected to determine whether, and to what degree, relationships existed between marital quality and five different types of intimacy.

The dependent variable for this study was ratings of marital qualtiy as measured by the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976). Five independent variables were studied: intellectual, social, recreational, emotional, and sexual intimacy. These were assessed by means of the Personal

Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships (Schaefer & Olson, 1981). Two scores were derived for each type of intimacy: a perceived or realized score and an expected or ideal intimacy score. The relationship between perceived and expected intimacy and marital quality was investigated for husbands and wives individually and for couples as a whole.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses, stated in null form, were tested in this study:

Hypothesis one: There is no relationship between scores on each of the five areas of perceived intimacy measured by the PAIR and scores on marital quality measured by the DAS.

Hypothesis two: There is no relationship between scores on each of the five areas of expected intimacy measured by the PAIR and scores on marital quality measured by the DAS.

Hypothesis three: There is no relationship between individual scores on marital quality assessed by the DAS and any discrepancy between individual scores on perceived and expected levels of intimacy as measured by the PAIR.

Hypothesis four: There is no relationship between a couple's combined scores on the DAS and their differences in scores on perceived intimacy in each of the five areas of intimacy assessed by the PAIR.

Hypothesis five: There is no relationship between a couple's combined scores on the DAS and their differences in scores on expected intimacy in each of the five areas of intimacy assessed by the PAIR.

Hypothesis six: There are no differences between males and females on perceived and expected intimacy as assessed by the PAIR inventory.

Subjects

The potential participant-pool for this study was comprised of all couples in the Gainesville area who satisfied the requirements for inclusion in the study sample. Gainesville is the major urban area of Alachua County, Florida. It is located in north central Florida. The population of the city of Gainesville is approximately 83,000. Gainesville is the home of the University of Florida, a public, state-funded institution. The university enrollment is approximately 33,000 with a faculty and staff of 9,332.

Participation in the study required couples to be married or living together for a minimum of one year and a maximum of ten; they also had to be childless at the time of participation in the study.

A total of eighty-five couples participated in this study. Twenty-seven couples were recruited from the community at large, while fifty-eight couples were recruited from the University of Florida family housing complexes.

Procedures

Couples for this study were selected from the Gainesville population. First, several attempts were made to recruit couples by advertising the opportunity to participate, without cost, in a one and a half hour enrichment program for couples. This advertisement was delivered door to

door to the two largest family housing complexes at the University of Florida and was also disseminated throughout the campus and the community at large. This approach was not successful in recruiting couples. A second attempt to recruit couples was made by contacting several churches in the Gainesville area and offering a program for couples. Although this attempt was a little more successful in attracting some couples, they all had children and therefore did not satisfy the requirements for inclusion in this investigation.

The procedure that proved successful for recruitment of childless couples was the personal contact. Two approaches were followed for recruiting childless couples by personal contact. One was contacting friends, colleagues, and acquaintances throughout the community to develop a search network for childless couples. These individuals through their places of employment and/or their community involvement located thirty-six childless couples willing to participate in this study. The researcher distributed the questionnaire packages to the contact persons and they distributed them to the childless couples. Each package contained two envelopes coded for males and females each containing all the inventories and consent form (see Appendix A) for each participant. The envelopes were self-addressed to the researcher and with postage so that once completed each participant could put it in the mail. Of the

thirty-six childless couples located by this approach thirty returned their inventories and of these, three were incomplete and therefore were not included in the study. A total of twenty-seven sets of usable responses were collected via this approach.

The second successful approach in recruiting childless couples was directly conducted by the researcher. A list of all students registered at the University of Florida for Summer Semester who had reported their marital status as married was secured from the office of the Registrar. This list contained the names and telephone numbers of 248 individuals living in four of the family housing complexes of the University of Florida. An attempt was made to contact on the phone all 248 individuals to locate those living with their spouses and without children. A total of 185 family housing households were contacted, and 81 childless couples were located through this method. Seventeen of the located childless couples declined to participate in the study, while sixty-four couples agreed to participate. Those childless couples willing to participate were delivered to their apartment doors a package containing two envelopes coded for males and females each containing all the inventories and consent form for each participant. Instructions were given for each spouse to complete the inventories independently of each other and to place the responses back in the envelope and seal it. Couples were later contacted on the phone again to make arrangements to collect their envelopes at their homes.

All sixty-four packages were collected. Two packages were left blank by both spouses, and four packages were incomplete and therefore they were not included in the study. A total of fifty-eight packages containing the responses of both spouses were secured in this manner.

Instrumentation

Two paper and pencil instruments and a demographic questionnaire were used in this study.

Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships

The Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationship (PAIR) is a self-report inventory developed by Schaefer and Olson (1981). Published by Family Social Science, University of Minnesota, the PAIR contains 36 items and assesses five types of intimacy: recreational, social, emotional, intellectual, and sexual. Six items measure each of the five areas. In addition, a conventionality scale (adapted from Edmonds, 1967) has been incorporated into the scale. Subjects are instructed to respond in two steps to the inventory. An individual first responds to the items in terms of how his/her relationship is at the present time (perceived or realized intimacy). After this step is completed, individuals are asked to respond to the same items in terms of how they would like their relationship to be (expected or ideal intimacy). Thus two scores are obtained for each of the five types of intimacy measured--a perceived score and an expected intimacy score; there is no "total" score.

The authors of this instrument indicate that the PAIR can be used with different types of relationships, from friendships to marriages (Schaefer & Olson, 1981). Test items are in the form of statements about the relationship, and the individual responds to them by using a five point scale: from strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, neutral, somewhat agree, to strongly agree.

The PAIR was developed in a relatively rigorous manner. There were seven a priori conceptual areas of intimacy: intellectual, emotional, sexual, recreational, social, aesthetic, and spiritual (Olson, 1975). Statements from professionals in the field of marriage and family studies were solicited in relation to these seven areas as well as in relation to intimacy in general. In addition, discussions with several groups about intimacy were taped and analyzed in order to search for additional dimensions of intimacy. These groups were composed of individuals involved in marital enrichment programs and graduate level family studies students. These statements, discussions, and tapes yielded 350 potential items which were classified by marriage and family professionals into the seven types of intimacy. One hundred and thirteen of those 350 items were selected based upon the criteria that they were conceptually related, clear and appropriate to the categories (Schaefer & Olson, 1981).

The first sample selected to validate the PAIR ranged in age from 18 to 61 with a median age of 29. Over 50% of

these individuals were married, 70% were females, and 30% males. The criteria used in selecting items for each scale were (1) that items had a frequency split of approximately 50%-50%, (2) that only items correlated highly with their own a priori scale were selected, (3) that items loaded sufficiently high on one factor, (4) and that items be balanced in terms of positive and negative scoring (Schaefer & Olson, 1981). Based on this item analysis, the aesthetic and spiritual intimacy scales were eliminated from the instrument.

Of the original factor pool of 113 items, 60 were selected for the inventory, ten items for each scale. Fifteen items of the Edmonds Conventionality Scale (Edmonds, 1967) were also included and scored separately in order to determine if the individual taking the inventory was attempting to create a good impression.

For the second application of the PAIR, 192 non-clinical couples were selected. Once again, both an item analysis and factor analysis were conducted to test for adequacy of the items and the scale. The same previously discussed criteria were utilized for item selection. At this time the inventory was modified to its present 36 item format in which six items are used in measuring each of five intimacy categories and an additional six items measure conventionality.

Validity and Reliability. Since the PAIR is a relatively new scale it is not reported in the measurement literature as of yet. Schaefer and Olson (1981) report, however, that in a concurrent

validity study conducted by Hanes and Waring (1979) the Waring Intimacy Questionnaire was compared to the PAIR. It was found that these two scales were significantly related ($r = .77$; $p < .01$) (Schaefer & Olson, 1981).

In its final form, the PAIR perceived scores were correlated with scores from the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test. The Pearson Correlation Coefficients reported from this comparison were as follows:

PAIR Subscales	Marital Adjustment		
	Husband	Wife	Couple
Emotional	.47	.57	.62
Social	.38	.44	.48
Sexual	.34	.36	.41
Intellectual	.51	.55	.61
Recreational	.51	.51	.59

Testing for reliability was done by the split-half method of analysis. The authors report that no test-retest analysis has been conducted. The Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients reported are as follows:

Subscale (6 items per scale)	Alpha Reliability Coefficient
Emotional	.75
Social	.71
Sexual	.77
Intellectual	.70
Recreational	.70
Conventionality	.80

Scores on the PAIR can range from 0 to 96. Average perceived scores reported for non-clinical couples are as follows: Emotional $\bar{X}$ = 46 SD = 17; Social $\bar{X}$ = 61 SD = 16.9; Intellectual $\bar{X}$ = 50 SD = 17; Sexual $\bar{X}$ = 58 SD = 18.8; Recreational $\bar{X}$ = 58 SD = 15; Conventionality $\bar{X}$ = 38 SD = 17. The average expected score ranged between 80 and 86. The average discrepancy between males and females in perceived scores was 14 to 20 points (Schaefer & Olson, 1981).

Dyadic Adjustment Scale

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) is a self-report inventory developed by Spanier (1976). It contains 32 items and measures overall marital quality. The inventory is composed of four subscales: Dyadic Consensus (13 items), Dyadic Satisfaction (10 items), Dyadic Cohesion (5 items), and Affectional Expression (4 items). This scale was developed for use with any type of primary relationships, but its validity and reliability were established with married and divorced individuals. The DAS does not have a measure of conventionality or social desirability.

Validity and Reliability. Extensive evidence regarding content validity, criterion-related validity, and construct validity are available for the Dyadic Adjustment Scale.

Content validity was obtained by evaluation of the scale by three judges. Items were included only if the judges considered them to be (1) relevant measures of dyadic adjustment for relationships of the seventies; (2) consistent with the theoretical definitions expressed by the author for

marital quality; (3) carefully worded with appropriate fixed choice responses (Spanier, 1976). Criterion-related validity was established by comparing responses of married vs. divorced individuals. "Each of the 32 items in the scale correlated significantly with the external criterion of marital status . . . for each item, the divorced sample differed significantly from the married sample ($p < .001$) using a t-test for assessing differences between sample means" (Spanier, 1976, p. 23). Construct validity was established by correlating the DAS with the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (Locke & Wallace, 1959). The correlation reported between these two scales for the total sample was .93 ($p < .001$) (Spanier, 1976).

In terms of reliability, Spanier (1976) reports a Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha of .96. A reliability coefficient of .96 was also obtained with the Spearman-Brown formula. In a recent confirmatory analysis of the DAS, Spanier and Thompson (1982) report obtaining a reliability coefficient of .91 using Cronbach's coefficient alpha with a new sample.

Scores for the DAS can range from 0 to 151. The average total scale score for the married sample was 114.8 with a standard deviation of 17.8; and for the divorced sample was 70.7 with a standard deviation of 23.8.

Applications of the DAS. Spanier and Thompson (1982) report than more than three hundred researchers have contacted the developer of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale indicating their wishes to use the inventory in research.

The following studies are just a few of those to have reached publication. They are reported here in chronological order. Houseknecht (1979) utilized the DAS to compare the marital adjustment of childless women with the marital adjustment of mothers. Fitzpatrick and Best (1979) employed the DAS to discriminate among various types of couples in terms of agreement-disagreement on couple's involvement together in outside activities. The DAS has also been utilized to study the relationship between female employment and marital adjustment (Houseknecht and Macke, 1981). Hansen (1981) reexamined the functionality of conventionalization on marital adjustment by means of the DAS. McRoy and Fisher (1982) examined the marital quality of graduate students using the DAS; while Davis and associates (1982) utilized the DAS to compare the effects of two different types of marital enrichment programs on marital adjustment. Spanier and Furstenberg (1982) utilized the DAS to establish the effects of remarriage status, sex, and presence or absence of children in the home on well-being. Finally, in 1983, two studies appeared in the literature utilizing the DAS. Davidson and associates (1983) studied the relationship between affective self-disclosure and marital adjustment in college students; while Thompson and Spanier (1983) studied the relationship between marital termination and marital history variables.

As this review of the utilization of the DAS demonstrates this inventory has been employed to study a wide variety of topics.

Demographic Information Questionnaire

The Demographic Information Questionnaire (see Appendix B) is a data sheet developed by the researcher to assess demographic characteristics of the sample to be studied. The use of this questionnaire allowed the investigator to assess the sex and age of participants, the number of years the individual has been married and whether or not there had been a previous marriage. It also assessed the number of children in the family, and if there were no children, the reasons for this decision. The Demographic Information Questionnaire also assessed the participants occupation, education, religious affiliation, and ethnicity. A final area of inquiry was assessing the individual's reaction to marital counseling.

Information obtained from this questionnaire was utilized solely for the purpose of describing the sample.

Analysis of Data

The data collected for this study were analyzed by several statistical procedures. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed to analyze hypotheses one, two, three, four, and five. Furthermore, regression analyses with quadratic and cubic terms included in the models were computed to further investigate the relationships postulated in hypotheses four and five. Hypothesis six was analyzed by computing a series of related sample t-tests.

To assess the combined contribution of all the independent variables to marital quality ratings, two overall

regression models were generated, one for males and one for females. These models were then reduced by use of stepwise regression procedures. Other regression models were also generated to assess the combined contribution of several clusters of intimacy variables to marital quality ratings. These models were also computed separately for males and for females, and the contributions of each variable to the total model were analyzed by testing partial regression coefficients.

Limitations of the Study

There were several factors involved in this study that may limit its generalizability. The first limitation concerns the sample employed. Couples selected for this study were volunteers; therefore they may not resemble the general population of couples. Generalizations of the findings of this study to non-volunteers should be done with caution. Another consideration is that data were collected only once. Relationships are processes in constant state of flux; therefore the study sampled just a point in time in the relationship rather than the relationship per se. A further limitation was related to the use of self-report measures. These types of assessment allow for the possibility of faking, attempting to present a good image, response set, and misunderstandings. Although some of these difficulties may have been balanced by the positive and negative scoring in the PAIR, others were not controlled for, and therefore they may have somewhat affected the results.

Finally, it is important to limit any generalization from this study to childless couples only, since it has been demonstrated by other researchers that these couples are a unique group with several differences from other couples populations.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship in childless couples between marital quality and five different intimacy variables. To accomplish this, responses to the Dyadic Adjustment Scale and the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships were collected from 85 childless couples. To analyze these relationships, Correlation Coefficients and related sample t-tests were computed. In addition, several regression models were developed to assess the combined contribution of the identified intimacy variables to ratings of marital quality.

This chapter includes a description of the sample utilized in the study, the results of the data analyses testing the six postulated hypotheses, and the results of the regression models.

Description of the Sample

A total of 117 childless couples were contacted for this study. Of these, seventeen couples refused to participate, eight couples did not return their inventories, and seven did not return completed questionnaires. Eighty-five couples (N = 170) returned complete data sets and were included in the study.

Results of the demographic questionnaire administered to all subjects revealed the average age for male subjects to

be 28.3 years, and the average age for female subjects to be 26.3 years. In terms of education the average number of years of school completed for males was 17.1, while for females it was 15.6. These findings are presented in Table 1. T-tests for related samples indicated that these differences between males and females were significant in both areas at the $p < .0001$ level of significance (age $t = 6.56$; school $t = 5.31$).

TABLE 1
AGE, EDUCATION, AND RELATED SAMPLE t-TEST FOR MALES AND FEMALES.

VARIABLE	MALE[a]			FEMALE			t-TEST
	MEAN	SD	RANGE	MEAN	SD	RANGE	
Age	28.3	5.8	20-53	26.3	4.7	19-48	6.56*
Education (in years)	17.1	2.5	12-24	15.6	2.1	10-24	5.31*

[a]n=85 for each sex group
*p < .0001

The sample was composed primarily of individuals in their first marriage (n = 158). Only nine participants reported that they were currently in a remarriage. In addition two participants reported their relationship status as divorced/cohabiting, while another reported widowed/remarried status. The average length of the present marital relationship for the total sample was 3.1 years. These sample characteristics are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2
RELATIONSHIP STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS

CHARACTERISTICS	N	YEARS
Average length of present relationship	170	3.1
Number of married only once	158	
Number of divorced/remarried	9	
Number of divorced/cohabiting	2	
Number of widowed/remarried	1	

Other characteristics describing the sample were those of religious affiliation, race or ethnicity, reasons for not having children, and occupational status. The sample consisted of 38% protestants, 28% without religious affiliation, 22% Catholics, 2% Muslem, 2% Jewish, 2% Buddists, 3% reporting either other religious affiliations or a combination of several of the above religions, and 3% did not respond to the religious affiliation question. The majority of the sample was white, 75%, followed by 12% of Hispanic origin, 9% Asian, and 3% black, other unspecified race or ethnic background comprised 1% of the sample.

Since the sample was restricted to childless couples, the decision concerning their childless status was assessed. Fifty-six percent reported they were postponing becoming parents. Sixteen percent reported they were unsure as to whether they wanted children. Fourteen percent reported they were expecting a child or in the process of attempting to

conceive one. Eight percent of the sample reported not wanting to have children, while 2% reported to be physically unable to have children and 2% reported disagreement with their spouse regarding wanting children. Two percent of the sample did not respond to the children question.

The occupational status of the participants was classified using a variation of the classification system developed by the U.S. Department of Labor (1965). Forty-four percent of the participants were students. (Another 8% reported student status as well as some sort of employment.) Twenty percent were classified as professional/managerial. Twelve percent were classified as sales/clerical. Nine percent reported occupations that were classified as skilled. Housewives comprised 3% of the respondents. One percent were in semi-skilled occupations, and 1% were unemployed. Two percent of the sample did not respond to the occupation question. These characteristics are summarized in Table 3.

In order to determine how representative the sample used in this study was of couples in general, mean scores and standard deviations were computed for both the DAS and the PAIR inventory by sex group and for the total sample. Results of these computations indicated that the sample can be classified as one of happily married couples based on its similarities with the DAS normative sample. Table 4 presents a comparison of DAS scores from this study with those reported for the development of the DAS.

TABLE 3
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS (IN PRECENTAGE)

CHARACTERISTICS[a]	%
RELIGION	
Protestant	38
None	28
Catholic	22
Muslem	2
Jewish	2
Buddist	2
Other	3
No response	3
RACE/ETHNICITY	
Caucasian	75
Hispanic	12
Asian	9
Black	3
Other	1
REASONS FOR NOT HAVING CHILDREN	
Postponing	56
Not sure of wanting children	16
Expecting or in the process of attempting to have children	14
Do not want children	8
Unable physically to have children	2
Disagreement with spouse regarding wanting children	2
No response	2
OCCUPATION	
Student	44
Professional/Managerial	20
Sales/Clerical	12
Skilled	9
Student/Employed	8
Housewife	3
Semi-skilled	1
Unemployed	1
No response	2

[a] N = 170

TABLE 4
MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND RANGE FOR THE DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE FOR THIS STUDY-SAMPLE AND THE NORMATIVE SAMPLE

VARIABLE	THIS SAMPLE[a]			SPANIER'S SAMPLE		
	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range
DAS	116.4	17.3	30-148	114.8	17.8	not reported

[a] N = 170

Results from the PAIR inventory yielded two sets of scores: one on perceived intimacy and the other on expected intimacy. A comparison between the scores obtained in this study and the ones reported by Schaefer and Olson (1981) in the Perceived Intimacy Scales is presented in Table 5. They are reported as with the normative sample by combining husband and wife scores and dividing them in half. Results from the Expected Intimacy Scales are presented in Table 6. Since Schaefer and Olson do not report these scores for the development of the PAIR, it is impossible to offer a comparison.

To further describe the sample from this study, another computation was executed. The discrepancy between perceived and expected intimacy was obtained for every participant in each of the five areas of intimacy studied and conventionality. The average discrepancies are presented separately for males and females in Table 7.

TABLE 5
MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND RANGE FOR PERCEIVED SCORES ON THE PERSONAL ASSESSMENT OF INTIMACY IN RELATIONSHIPS FOR THIS STUDY-SAMPLE AND THE NORMATIVE SAMPLE

PAIR SCALES	THIS SAMPLE[a]			SCHAEFER AND OLSON'S SAMPLE		
	MEAN	SD	RANGE	MEAN	SD	RANGE
Perceived Emotional Intimacy (PEI)	71.7	20.9	00-96	46	17	10-88
Perceived Social Intimacy (PSI)	65.4	20.8	08-96	61	16.9	14-92
Perceived Sexual Intimacy (PSXI)	73.6	20.9	04-96	58	18.8	06-94
Perceived Intellectual Intimacy (PII)	69.5	19.8	00-96	50	17	12-88
Perceived Recreational Intimacy (PRI)	72.8	17.5	00-96	58	15	16-92
Convention-ality	66.8	20.8	00-96	38	17	08-86

[a] N = 170

TABLE 6
MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND RANGE
FOR EXPECTED SCORES ON THE PERSONAL ASSESSMENT
OF INTIMACY IN RELATIONSHIPS

PAIR SCALES	MEAN[a]	SD	RANGE
Expected Emotional Intimacy (EEI)	90.7	8.3	64-96
Expected Social Intimacy (ESI)	75.9	15.8	28-96
Expected Sexual Intimacy (ESXI)	88.4	11.1	48-96
Expected Intellectual Intimacy (EII)	83.6	12.6	48-96
Expected Recreational Intimacy (ERI)	86	9.9	56-96

[a]N = 170

TABLE 7
MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND RANGE FOR THE DISCREPANY SCORES
ON THE PAIR INVENTORY BETWEEN PERCEIVED AND EXPECTED INTIMACY

AREA OF DISCREPANCY*	MALES[a]			FEMALES		
	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range
Emotional Intimacy (DEI)	15.6	18.2	-08 84	22.2	21.6	-08 84
Social Intimacy (DSI)	11.2	16.5	-16 76	9.6	16.5	-44 72
Sexual Intimacy (DSXI)	14.0	20.0	-24 80	15.3	20.2	-16 92
Intellectual Intimacy (DII)	12.7	16.2	-12 72	15.3	17.2	-12 60
Recreational Intimacy (DRI)	13.9	15.4	-20 84	12.3	15.5	-16 72

*Discrepancy scores = Individual Expected Score minus Perceived Score
[a]n = 85 for each sex group

Findings Relating to the Null Hypotheses

Six research hypotheses were postulated for this study in terms of single relationships between the dependent variable of marital quality and each of the independent variables of perceived and expected intimacy. All hypotheses were tested separately for males and for females.

> Hypothesis one: There is no relationship between scores on each of the five areas of perceived intimacy measured by the PAIR inventory and scores on marital quality measured by the DAS.

To test this hypothesis, correlations coefficients between scores on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale and scores on the five areas of perceived intimacy assessed by the Personal Assessment of Intimacy in Relationships were computed separately for males and females. As shown in Table 8, all correlations obtained were significant at the $p < .0001$ level of significance. Therefore hypothesis one was rejected.

The trend in the correlations was very similar for both males and females. The relationship between marital quality scores and perceived emotional intimacy scores was the highest for both males and females: males $r = .80$, females $r = .82$. Perceived intellectual and recreational intimacy were the next two more powerful correlations. Perceived intellectual intimacy correlated with the DAS scores as follows: for males $r = .72$, for females $r = .79$. Perceived recreational intimacy correlated with the DAS scores in the following manner: for males $r = .67$, for females $r = .79$. The perceived social intimacy scale correlated with the DAS scores $r = .58$ for

TABLE 8
PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS RELATING DAS SCORES WITH EACH OF THE FIVE PAIR PERCEIVED SCALE SCORES AND CONVENTIONALITY

PAIR SCALES	DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE	
	Male[a]	Female
Perceived Emotional Intimacy	.80*	.82*
Perceived Social Intimacy	.58*	.53*
Perceived Sexual Intimacy	.49*	.65*
Perceived Intellectual Intimacy	.72*	.79*
Perceived Recreational Intimacy	.67*	.79*
Conventionality	.73*	.82*

[a] n = 85 for each sex group
* p < .0001

males, r = .53 for females. The perceived sexual intimacy relationship to the DAS scores was r = .49 for males and r = .65 for females.

A correlation coefficient was also computed to assess the relationship between the Dyadic Adjustment Scale scores and PAIR Conventionality Scale scores. The correlation coefficients obtained for this relationship were r = .73 for males and r = .82 for females.

Hypothesis two: There is no relationship between scores on each of the five areas of expected intimacy measured by the PAIR and scores on marital quality measured by the DAS.

The relationships between marital quality and each of the five areas of expected intimacy were assessed by computing

Pearson Correlation Coefficients between DAS scores and the scores from the five expected intimacy scales of the PAIR for males and females. These results are presented in Table 9. Although the relationships were not as strong as those demonstrated with the perceived scores, several of them were statistically significant. Thus hypothesis two was rejected.

The relationship between expected emotional intimacy scores and the DAS scores was not significant for males; however it was significant for females $r = .44$ ($p < .0001$). The relationship between expected social intimacy scores and the DAS scores was not significant for either males or females. Expected sexual intimacy turned out to be significant for females $r = .30$ ($p < .005$) but not significant for males.

The relationships between marital quality scores and expectations of intellectual and recreational intimacy were significant both for males and females. Expected intellectual intimacy scores correlated with the DAS scores $r = .31$ ($p < .005$) for males and $r = .27$ ($p < .01$) for females. Expected recreational intimacy scores correlated with the DAS scores $r = .26$ ($p < .01$) for males and $r = .24$ ($p < .05$) for females.

Hypothesis three: There is no relationship between individual scores on marital quality assessed by the DAS and any discrepancy between individual scores on perceived and expected levels of intimacy as measured by the PAIR.

TABLE 9
PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS RELATING DAS SCORES WITH EACH OF THE FIVE PAIR EXPECTED SCALE SCORES

PAIR SCALES	DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE	
	Male[a]	Female
Expected Emotional Intimacy	.21(ns)	.44*
Expected Social Intimacy	.10(ns)	.17(ns)
Expected Sexual Intimacy	.01(ns)	.30**
Expected Intellectual Intimacy	.31**	.27***
Expected Recreational Intimacy	.26***	.24****

[a]n = 85 for each sex group
*p < .0001
**p < .005
***p < .01
****p < .05

To test this hypothesis a new set of variables was developed by subtracting the perceived PAIR intimacy score for each area from the expected score in that same area. Five differential scores were obtained in this manner; these differential scores were then correlated with individual DAS scores for males and for females. Each of these five differential variables scores was significantly related at the $p < .0001$ level of significance to the DAS scores for both males and females. Thus hypothesis three was rejected. These findings are presented in Table 10. The relationships among the DAS scores and the differences between perceived and expected intimacy

TABLE 10
PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS RELATING DAS SCORES WITH EACH OF THE FIVE PAIR DIFFERENTIAL SCORES

DIFFERENTIAL VARIABLES (Expected-perceived)	DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE	
	Male[a]	Female
Diff. in Emotional Intimacy	-.72*	-.73*
Diff. in Social Intimacy	-.65*	-.48*
Diff. in Sexual Intimacy	-.49*	-.54*
Diff. in Intellectual Intimacy	-.58*	-.77*
Diff. in Recreational Intimacy	-.55*	-.77*

[a] n = 85 for each sex group
* p < .0001

scores were all negative, suggesting an inverse relationship between marital quality and individual discrepancies in intimacy. That is marital quality scores decreased as the gap between perceived and expected intimacy scores increased. Although all these relationships were significant, no apparent trend emerged. For males, the correlations among the DAS and the differential intimacy variables were as follows: Emotional r = -.72; Social r = -.65; Sexual r = -.49; Intellectual r = -.58; Recreational r = -.55. For females, the correlations among the DAS and the differences between expected and perceived intimacy were as follows: Emotional r = -.73; Social r = -.48; Sexual r = -.54; Intellectual r = -.77; and Recreational r = -.77.

Hypothesis four: There is no relationship between a couple's combined scores on the DAS and their differences in scores on perceived intimacy in each of the five areas of intimacy assessed by the PAIR.

Hypothesis four postulated that there was no relationship between a couple's combined marital quality score and differences in their perceptions of intimacy. To assess these relationships two new sets of variables were created. A combined couple marital quality score variable was created by adding the scores of husbands and wives on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. A couple's perceived intimacy discrepancy variables were created by subtracting the wife's scores on perceived intimacy from the husband's scores for each couple on each of the five areas of intimacy studied. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were then generated for each of these hypothesized relationships. Setting the probability level of significance at $p < .05$, none of these relationships were found to be significant. Therefore hypothesis four was not rejected. Table 11 depicts these findings.

Since the findings of Table 11 suggested the possibility of a nonlinear relationship between the combined DAS scores and each of the differential variables of intimacy, a second and third degree regression equation was generated and examined. Results of these computations are shown in Table 12. Tests of partial regression coefficients indicated that adding a quadratic term to the regression equation was significant for some of the relationships. The relationship

TABLE 11
PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS RELATING COMBINED COUPLE'S DAS SCORES WITH DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SPOUSES IN EACH OF THE FIVE AREAS OF PAIR PERCEIVED SCORES

DIFFERENTIAL VARIABLES (Husband Perceived-Wife Perceived)	DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE (Husband + wife scores)[a]
Diff. in Emotional Intimacy	-.19(ns)
Diff. in Social Intimacy	.16(ns)
Diff. in Sexual Intimacy	-.15(ns)
Diff. in Intellectual Intimacy	-.09(ns)
Diff. in Recreational Intimacy	-.17(ns)

[a]N = 85 couples
*p < .05

TABLE 12
PARTIAL F VALUES, PROBABILITY OF F AND R-SQUARE OF THE NONLINEAR MODEL OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALES AND FEMALES ON PERCEIVED INTIMACY GIVEN THAT THE LINEAR TERMS ARE ALREADY IN THE MODEL

DIFF. BETWEEN SPOUSES	F VALUE	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI	2.59	.06	.08
PSI	1.86	.14	.06
PSXI	3.80	.01*	.12
PII	1.43	.23	.05
PRI	3.73	.01*	.12
Conventionality	2.87	.04**	.09

N = 85

between combined scores on the DAS and the differences between spouses in the areas of perceived emotional, social, and intellectual intimacy were not significant. On the other hand, combined scores on the DAS were significantly related to the differences between spouses in perceived sexual ($F = 3.80$ $p < .01$), and recreational intimacy ($F = 3.73$ $p < .01$) as well as on conventionality ($F = 2.87$ $p < .04$).

Hypothesis five: There is no relationship between a couple's combined scores on the DAS and their differences in scores on expected intimacy in each of the five areas of intimacy assessed by the PAIR.

Hypothesis five postulated that there were no relationships between a couple's combined DAS scores and their differences in expectations of intimacy. To assess these relationships the combined marital quality variable created to test hypothesis four was employed, and new differential variables were created by subtracting the wife's scores on expected intimacy from the husband's scores for each couple for each of the five areas of intimacy. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were then calculated for all these relationships. None of these relationships were significant at the $p < .05$ level of significance. Thus hypothesis five failed to be rejected also. These findings are illustrated in Table 13.

As with the case of hypothesis four, these findings may indicate that in reality there is no relationship between combined scores on the DAS and the differences between spouses scores on intimacy, but they may also suggest a nonlinear

TABLE 13
PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS RELATING COMBINED COUPLE'S DAS SCORED WITH DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SPOUSES IN EACH OF THE FIVE AREAS OF PAIR EXPECTED SCORES

DIFFERENTIAL VARIABLES (Husband Expected-Wife Expected)	DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE (Husband + Wife Scores)[a]
Diff. in Emotional Intimacy	-.11(ns)
Diff. in Social Intimacy	-.02(ns)
Diff. in Sexual Intimacy	-.18(ns)
Diff. in Intellectual Intimacy	.08(ns)
Diff. in Recreational Intimacy	.02(ns)

[a] N = 85 couples
* p < .05

relationship. To investigate the possibility of a nonlinear relationship a second and third degree regression equation was generated and analyzed. Table 14 depicts these findings.

The relationship between differences between spouses scores on expected social, and intellectual intimacy with combined scores on the DAS yielded non-significant results. A significant relationship was established between combined scores on the DAS and differences between spouses on expected emotional intimacy ($F = 6.09$ $p < .001$), expected sexual intimacy ($F = 11.46$ $p < .0001$), and recreational intimacy ($F = 3.60$ $p < .01$).

Hypothesis six: There are no differences between males and females on perceived and expected intimacy as assessed by the PAIR inventory.

TABLE 14
PARTIAL F VALUES, PROBABILITY OF F, AND R-SQUARE OF THE NONLINEAR MODEL OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALES AND FEMALES ON EXPECTED INTIMACY GIVEN THAT THE LINEAR TERMS ARE ALREADY IN THE MODEL

DIFF. BETWEEN SPOUSES	F VALUE	P > F	R-SQUARE
EEI	6.09	.001*	.18
ESI	0.23	.87	.008
ESXI	11.46	.0001*	.29
EII	0.77	.51	.02
ERI	3.60	.01	.11

N = 85

Since hypothesis six postulated that there were no differences between the sexes in their perceptions and expectations of intimacy, the analyses utilized to assess this question were those of t-tests for related samples. T-tests of the differences between male and female PAIR score means were calculated. The results of these t-tests appear in Table 15. Significant differences between male and female mean scores were found for both the perceived emotional and recreational intimacy scales ($p < .05$). Thus hypothesis six was rejected.

Although not stated as a research hypothesis, one important aspect of this study was to ascretain the combined effect of intimacy on marital quality. Since it was demonstrated in this study that each of the rating of perceived intimacy, and several of the expected intimacy ratings are

TABLE 15
RELATED SAMPLE T-TEST OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE MEAN SCORES ON THE PAIR INVENTORY SCALES[a]

PAIR SCALES	t	PR T
PEI	2.30	.02*
PSI	-1.91	.06
PSXI	0.48	.63
PII	0.61	.54
PRI	-2.36	.02*
Conv.	0.40	.69
EEI	-1.48	.14
ESI	-1.10	.27
ESXI	-0.25	.80
EII	-1.07	.28
ERI	-1.46	.14

[a]N = 85 couples
*p < .05

significantly related to marital quality, the next logical step was to estimate the amount of variance in marital quality scores that could be attributed to the combined independent variables. To accomplish this, a series of regression equations were computed and analyzed separately for males and females.

To estimate the combined contribution of perceived intimacy and conventionality to marital quality, a regression model

that included the five areas of perceived intimacy and the conventionality scale was generated. Results of these findings are presented in Table 16.

TABLE 16
F VALUES, PROBABILITY OF F, AND R-SQUARES FOR THE REGRESSION MODEL ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DAS AND PERCEIVED INTIMACY AND CONVENTIONALITY FOR MALES AND FEMALES

MODEL	MALES[a]			FEMALES		
	F	P > F	R-SQUARE	F	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI PSI PSXI PII PRI CONV	38.59	.0001	.74	57.81	.0001	.81

[a] n = 85 for each sex group

The combined contribution of perceived emotional, social, sexual, intellectual, and recreational intimacy plus conventionality was found significant for both males and females. For males, this contribution accounted for 74% of the variance in marital quality scores (F = 38.59, P > F = .001, R-Square = .74), while for females, the combined contribution of perceived intimacy and conventionality accounted for 81% of the variance in marital quality scores (F = 57.81, P > F = .0001, R-Square = .81). By analyzing the partial regression coefficients for this model, it was discovered that some of the variables were not significant beyond the contribution of others when entered into the model. Therefore a stepwise regression procedure with a criterion of .05 level of significance was computed to estimate the best predictive models of marital quality from the perceived intimacy and

conventionality scores model. The stepwise regression procedure identified perceived emotional intimacy, perceived social intimacy, conventionality, and perceived recreational intimacy as the best predictor of marital quality scores for males, accounting for 74% of its variance ($F = 57.95$, $P > F = .0001$, R-square = .74). Partial F values, probability levels, and R-square increases for this model depicting the contribution of each significant variable to the total model are presented in Table 17.

TABLE 17
PARTIAL F VALUES, PROBABILITY OF F, AND R-SQUARES FOR THE STEPWISE REGRESSION PROCEDURE ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAS SCORES AND PERCEIVED INTIMACY AND CONVENTIONALITY SCORES FOR MALES

VARIABLE[a]	PARTIAL F	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI	154.24	.0001	.65
PSI/PEI	11.58	.001	.69
Conv./PEI, PSI	8.13	.005	.72
PRI/PEI, PSI, Conv.	6.87	.01	.74

[a] n = 85

The stepwise procedure eliminated both perceived sexual intimacy and perceived intellectual intimacy as not contributing to marital quality scores beyond the contribution of the four identified significant variables. Perceived emotional intimacy by itself predicted 65% of the variance in marital quality scores, while perceived social intimacy, conventionality, and perceived recreational intimacy contributed an additional 4%, 3%, and 2% respectively as each variable was added to the model.

The three variable model that best predicted marital quality scores for females was composed of perceived emotional intimacy, perceived recreational intimacy, and conventionality. These three variables accounted for 80% of the variance in marital quality ($F = 111.58$, $P > F = .0001$, R-Square = .80). Table 18 reports the partial F values, probability levels, and R-square increases for this model.

TABLE 18
PARTIAL F VALUES, PROBABILITY LEVELS, AND R-SQUARES FOR THE STEPWISE REGRESSION PROCEDURE ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAS SCORES AND PERCEIVED INTIMACY AND CONVENTIONALITY SCORES FOR FEMALES

VARIABLE[a]	PARTIAL F	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI	179.32	.0001	.68
PRI/PEI	27.44	.0001	.76
Conv./PEI,PRI	17.56	.0001	.80

[a] n = 85

Perceived social intimacy, perceived sexual intimacy, and perceived intellectual intimacy were eliminated from the model as not contributing to the marital quality of females beyond the contribution of perceived emotional intimacy, perceived recreational intimacy, and conventionality. These three variables increased the R-Square value 68%, 8%, and 4% respectively when each of them was entered into the model.

Since conventionality is not a measure of intimacy it was decided to also assess the contribution of perceived

intimacy to marital quality once conventionality was removed from the regression model. These findings appear in Table 19.

TABLE 19
F VALUES, PROBABILITY OF F, AND R-SQUARE FOR THE REGRESSION MODEL ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DAS AND PERCEIVED INTIMACY FOR MALES AND FEMALES

MODEL	MALE[a]			FEMALE		
	F	P > F	R-SQUARE	F	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI PSI PSXI PII PRI	42.06	.0001	.72	60.17	.0001	.79

[a]n = 85 for each sex group.

Once conventionality was eliminated from the model, perceived intimacy scores continued to be a powerful and significant predictor of marital quality for both males and females. For males this model reached 72% of the variance in marital quality scores (F = 42.06, P > F = .0001, R-Square = .72). For females, 79% of the variance in marital quality scores was predicted from the perceived intimacy scores (F = 60.17, P > F = .0001, R-Square = .79). Since the partial regression coefficients indicated that some of the terms in the equation did not contribute to the predictive value of the total model, a stepwise regression procedure was employed for each sex group to ascertain the best predictive model of marital quality based on perceived intimacy.

For males, the perceived intimacy model that best predicted marital quality was the one including the variables

of emotional intimacy, social intimacy, and recreational intimacy. These findings are depicted in Table 20. These three variables combined contributed 71% of the variance in male marital quality scores ($F = 68.84$, $P > F = .0001$, R-Square = .71). The individual cumulative contribution of each of these variables to the predictive model was 65%, 4%, and 2% respectively.

TABLE 20
PARTIAL F VALUES, PROBABILITY LEVELS, AND R-SQUARES FOR THE STEPWISE REGRESSION PROCEDURE ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAS SCORES AND PERCEIVED INTIMACY SCORES FOR MALES

VARIABLE[a]	PARTIAL F	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI	154.24	.0001	.65
PSI/PEI	11.58	.001	.69
PRI/PEI,PSI	7.14	.009	.71

[a] n = 85

The stepwise procedure for perceived intimacy resulted in a different model for females. These results are shown in Table 21. The best model for the female sample included the variables of perceived emotional intimacy, perceived intellectual intimacy, and perceived recreational intimacy, and accounted for 77% of the variance in female's marital quality scores ($F = 94.97$, $P > F = .0001$, R-Square = .77). The individual cumulative contribution of each of these predictive variables to marital quality scores was 68%, 8%, and 1% respectively.

In order to better understand the relationship between intimacy and marital quality, several additional regression

TABLE 21
PARTIAL F VALUES, PROBABILITY LEVELS, AND R-SQUARES FOR THE STEPWISE REGRESSION PROCEDURE ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCORES ON THE DAS AND PERCEIVED INTIMACY FOR FEMALES

VARIABLE[a]	PARTIAL F	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI	179.32	.0001	.68
PRI/PEI	27.44	.0001	.76
PII/PEI ,PRI	5.75	.01	.77

[a]n = 85

analyses were executed. First the combined contribution of expected intimacy to marital quality was investigated. All of the expected intimacy variables were entered into a regression model and computed separately for males and for females. Results of these computations are presented in Table 22.

TABLE 22
F VALUES, PROBABILITY OF F, AND R-SQUARE FOR THE REGRESSION MODEL ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DAS AND EXPECTED INTIMACY FOR MALES AND FEMALES

MODEL	MALE[a]			FEMALE		
	F	P > F	R-SQUARE	F	P > F	R-SQUARE
EEI ESI ESXI EII ERI	2.80	.02	.15	4.54	.001	.22

[a]n = 85 for each sex group.

The results obtained from combining the contribution of expected intimacy scores, although significant, demonstrated that expected intimacy scores account for only 15% of the variance in marital quality scores for males ($F = 2.80$, $P > F = .02$, R-Square = .15) and 22% of the variance in marital quality scores for females ($F = 4.54$, $P > F = .001$, R-Square = .22).

The importance of the differences between perceived and expected intimacy in relation to marital quality was also investigated. Again, a separate model for males and females was generated and the discrepancy between perceived and expected intimacy was entered into the regression model. These discrepancy or differential variables were created by subtracting perceived intimacy scores in each of the five intimacy areas from their corresponding area of expected intimacy. Table 23 illustrates these findings.

TABLE 23
F VALUES, PROBABILITY OF F, AND R-SQUARE FOR THE REGRESSION MODEL ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DAS AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCEIVED AND EXPECTED INTIMACY FOR MALES AND FEMALES

MODEL	MALES[a]			FEMALES		
	F	P > F	R-SQUARE	F	P > F	R-SQUARE
DEI DSI DSXI DII DRI	24.28	.0001	.60	46.63	.0001	.74

[a]n = 85 for each sex group

The combined contribution of differences between perceived and expected intimacy scores was significant for both males and females. For males the combined difference between perceived and expected intimacy scores accounted for 60% of the variance in marital quality scores ($F = 24.28$, $P > F = .0001$, R-Square = .60). This relationship was even stronger for females. Seventy-four percent of the variance in female marital quality scores was accounted by the differences between perceptions and expectations of intimacy ($F = 46.63$, $P > F = .0001$, R-Square = .74).

A look at the partial regression coefficients for this model indicated that not all the variables were significant contributors to marital quality. Hence a stepwise regression procedure was utilized to eliminate the non-contributors from the model. Results from the stepwise procedure identified a two variable model for males (See Table 24), and a three variable model for females (See Table 25).

This stepwise procedure resulted in a reduced model in which the difference between perceived and expected emotional intimacy scores, and between perceived and expected social intimacy scores accounted for 60% of the variance in marital quality scores for males ($F = 60.38$, $P > F = .0001$, R-Square = .60). Individually, each of these two differential variables contributed 52% and 8% respectively to male's marital quality scores. For the female subsample the stepwise procedure yielded a three variable model that included the

TABLE 24
PARTIAL F VALUES, PROBABILITY LEVELS, AND R-SQUARES FOR THE STEPWISE REGRESSION PROCEDURE ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAS SCORES AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCEIVED AND EXPECTED INTIMACY SCORES FOR MALES

VARIABLE[a]	PARTIAL F	P > F	R-SQUARE
DEI	90.74	.0001	.52
DSI/DEI	14.85	.0002	.60

[a] n = 85

TABLE 25
PARTIAL F VALUES, PROBABILITY LEVELS, AND R-SQUARES FOR THE STEPWISE REGRESSION PROCEDURE ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAS SCORES AND DIFFERENCES IN PERCEIVED AND EXPECTED INTIMACY SCORES FOR FEMALES

VARIABLE[a]	PARTIAL F	P > F	R-SQUARE
DEI	76.88	.0001	.59
DRI/DEI	27.21	.0004	.72
DII/DEI, DRI	13.71	.0001	.74

[a] n = 85

difference between perceived and expected emotional intimacy, between perceived and expected recreational intimacy, and between perceived and expected intellectual intimacy scores. This model accounted for 74% of the variance in marital quality scores for females (F = 76.88, P > F = .0001, R-Square = .74). Partial regression coefficients for this model indicated that each of these variables contributed 59%, 13%, and 2% respectively to the combined prediction of marital quality scores, in a cumulative manner.

In an attempt to estimate the relationship between the DAS scores and the PAIR inventory scores, an overall regression model including perceptions and expectations of intimacy was generated and analyzed separately for males and females. This model included the scores on the five areas of perceived intimacy, the five areas of expected intimacy, and the conventionality scale. The results are reported in Table 26.

TABLE 26
F VALUES, PROBABILITY OF F, AND R-SQUARE FOR THE OVERALL REGRESSION MODEL ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DAS AND THE PAIR INVENTORY FOR MALES AND FEMALES

MODEL	MALES[a]			FEMALES		
	F	P > F	R-SQUARE	F	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI PSI PSXI PII PRI CONV EEI ESI ESXI EII ERI	25.94	.0001	.79	35.15	.0001	.84

[a]n = 85 for each sex group

The results of the overall model showed a strong relationship between scores on the DAS and scores on the PAIR inventory. For males, this relationship had a multiple correlation coefficient of R = .88, and indicated that 79% of the variance on the DAS scores was accounted for by scores on the PAIR inventory (F = 25.94, P > F = .0001, R-Square = .79). For females the multiple correlation coefficient between DAS scores and PAIR scores was R = .91, indicating that 84% of

the variance on female DAS scores was accounted by their scores on the PAIR inventory ($F = 35.15$, $P > F = .0001$, R-Square = .84).

Analysis of the partial regression coefficients for all the variables in the overall model suggested that the model could be reduced without lowering its predictive value since several of the terms in the equation were not significant contributors to the R-square value. Therefore, the stepwise procedure was employed to generate the best predictive model. This procedure resulted in a five variable model for males, and a three variable model for females. When all the PAIR variables were entered into the regression model, the stepwise procedure selected perceived emotional intimacy, perceived social intimacy, expected social intimacy, expected intellectual intimacy, and perceived recreational intimacy as the best model to predict male scores on the DAS. The reduced model accounted for 77% of the variance in marital quality scores ($F = 53.49$, $P > F = .0001$, R-Square = .77) and is depicted in Table 27. The partial regression coefficients for this model indicated that perceived emotional intimacy scores contributed 65% of the variance on marital quality scores, while the other four variables contributed an additional 4%, 3%, 3%, and 2% respectively as each variable was added to the model.

The reduced model for females was composed of perceived emotional intimacy scores, perceived recreational intimacy scores, and conventionality scores. These three variables combined accounted for 80% of the variance on the DAS scores ($F =$

TABLE 27
PARTIAL F VALUES, PROBABILITY LEVELS, AND R-SQUARES FOR THE STEPWISE REGRESSION PROCEDURE ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DAS AND THE PAIR INVENTORY SCORES FOR MALES

VARIABLE[a]	PARTIAL F	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI	154.24	.0001	.65
PSI/PEI	11.58	.001	.69
ESI/PEI, PSI	10.19	.002	.72
EII/PEI, PSI, ESI	8.92	.003	.75
PRI/PEI, PSI, ESI, EII	5.87	.01	.77

[a]n = 85

111.58, P > F = .0001, R-Square = .80). These findings are shown in Table 28. Individually, perceived emotional intimacy contributed 68% of the variance in marital quality scores when all these variables were in the model, in addition perceived recreational intimacy contributed 8%, and conventionality scores contributed 4%, when entered into the model.

TABLE 28
PARTIAL F VALUES, PROBABILITY LEVELS, AND R-SQUARES FOR THE STEPWISE REGRESSION PROCEDURE ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DAS AND THE PAIR INVENTORY SCORES FOR FEMALES

VARIABLE[a]	PARTIAL F	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI	179.32	.0001	.68
PRI/PEI	20.93	.0001	.76
Conv./PEI, PRI	17.56	.0001	.80

[a]n = 85

Finally, the combined contribution to marital quality scores of perceived intimacy and differences between perceptions and expectations of intimacy was assessed. This model included the five perceived intimacy variables and the five differential variables, and was computed separately for males and females. These results are presented in Table 29.

TABLE 29
F VALUE, PROBABILITY OF F, AND R-SQUARE FOR THE REGRESSION MODEL ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAS SCORES AND, PERCEIVED INTIMACY AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF INTIMACY

MODEL	MALES[a]			FEMALES		
	F	P > F	R-SQUARE	F	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI PSI PSXI PII PRI DEI DSI DSXI DII DRI	27.63	.0001	.78	35.23	.0001	.82

[a] n = 85 for each sex group

Analysis of the partial regression coefficients indicated that several of the variables in both the male and female models did not contribute significantly to the overall prediction of marital quality scores. A stepwise regression procedure was then generated to identify the best predictive models for males and females from all the variables included in the perceived-differential intimacy model. The model generated from this procedure for males is depicted in Table 30. It included the variables perceived emotional intimacy, the difference between perceptions and expectations of social

intimacy, perceived recreational intimacy, and perceived intellectual intimacy. This model accounted for 76% of the variance in male's marital quality scores (F = 64.84, P > F = .0001, R-Square = .76). Given that all these variables were in the model, their individual cumulative contribution to the overall prediction of marital quality scores was 65%, 7%, 3%, and 1% respectively.

TABLE 30
PARTIAL F VALUES, PROBABILITY LEVELS, AND R-SQUARES FOR THE STEPWISE REGRESSION PROCEDURE ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAS SCORES AND, PERCEIVED INTIMACY AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF INTIMACY FOR MALES

VARIABLE[a]	PARTIAL F	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI	154.24	.0001	.65
DSI/PEI	21.00	.0001	.72
PSI/PEI, DSI	9.62	.002	.75
PII/PEI, DSI, PSI	4.49	.03	.76

[a] n = 85

The female model that emerged from the stepwise regression procedure was also a four variable model. It included perceived emotional intimacy, the difference between perceptions and expectations of recreational intimacy, perceived intellectual intimacy, and the difference between perceptions and expectations of social intimacy. These variables individually and cumulatively contributed 68%, 8%, 3%, and 1% respectively to the variance in marital quality scores accounting for a total

of 80% of the female's marital quality scores (F = 83.20, P > F = .0001, R-Square = .80). Table 31 depicts these findings.

TABLE 31
PARTIAL F VALUES, PROBABILITY LEVELS, AND R-SQUARES FOR THE STEPWISE REGRESSION PROCEDURE ESTIMATING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAS SCORES AND, PERCEIVED INTIMACY AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS OF INTIMACY FOR FEMALES

VARIABLE[a]	PARTIAL F	P > F	R-SQUARE
PEI	179.32	.0001	.68
DRI/PEI	27.73	.0001	.76
PII/PEI, DRI	12.66	.0006	.79
DSI/PEI, DRI, PII	4.41	.03	.80

[a] n = 85

Summary

The results of this study indicated that a relationship exists between marital quality and intimacy. These results were analyzed separately for males and females, and yielded different findings for the two groups.

In terms of the single relationships between each of the independent variables and the dependent variable, hypotheses one, two, three, and six were rejected. Tests for hypothesis one indicated that a strong and significant relationship existed between each of the five areas of perceived intimacy and marital quality scores for both males and females. A strong and significant relationship was also

established for both sexes between marital quality scores and conventionality scores. Testing of hypothesis two yielded a significant relationship between marital quality scores and expected intellectual intimacy scores and expected recreational intimacy scores for males. For females, the significant relationships derived from testing this hypothesis were between marital quality and expected sexual intimacy, expected intellectual intimacy, and expected recreational intimacy scores. Significant relationships were also established both for males and females, between the differences in perceived and expected intimacy scores in all five areas and marital quality scores by testing hypothesis three. Tests for hypothesis six established that there were significant differences between males and females perceptions of intimacy in the emotional and recreational areas, but no significant difference was found between males and females expectations of intimacy.

Hypotheses four and five were not rejected because no significant linear relationship was found between the combined couples' marital quality scores and their differences in perceptions nor expectations of intimacy scores. However, when a quadratic and a cubic terms were added to the tests of these hypotheses, significant results were found. These results suggested a non-linear relationship between combined couples' marital quality scores and differences in perceptions of sexual intimacy, and recreational intimacy; between differences in conventionality scores and combined couples'

marital quality scores; and between differences in expected emotional, and sexual intimacy scores, and combined couples' marital quality scores.

Finally, the assessment of the combined contribution of intimacy scores to marital quality scores was estimated, for men and women separately, by a series of regression equations. These regression equations were estimated for the combined contribution of perceived intimacy, and conventionality; for the combined contribution of perceived intimacy by itself; for the combined contribution of expected intimacy; for the combined contribution of the differences between perceptions and expectations of intimacy; for the combined contribution to marital quality of all eleven intimacy variables; and for the combined contribution of the differences between perceptions and expectations of intimacy, and the perceived intimacy variables. These results were all significant, and in all areas different models emerged for men and women.

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The primary objective of this study was to assess whether and to what degree a relationship existed between marital quality and intimacy in childless couples. The results indicated that a strong and significant relationship existed between marital quality and intimacy in the sample studied. This chapter presents a discussion of the results reported in Chapter four. A comparison will be made between the present sample and the normative samples cited by Spanier (1976), and Schaefer and Olson (1981). A discussion of the findings relating to the hypotheses tested will also be offered. Conclusions based on this study will be presented. In addition, a section on recommendations for the future will be found at the end of the chapter.

Discussion

There are several similarities and differences between the present study sample and the normative sample of the DAS. Although the sample size was smaller than the one discussed by Spanier (1976) the average score on the DAS for this sample compared quite well with the average score reported by Spanier for happily married couples. In terms of sample characteristics this study sample was younger, had more advanced education, was married for less number of years, and had less of a religious affiliation than that reported

in the Spanier sample. These demographic differences, given similar scores on the DAS, tend to support the notion presented in the review of the literature that demographic characteristics have very little to do with the prediction of marital quality (Campbell, et al., 1976; Gottman, 1979; Young, 1982).

A comparison of this study sample with the one described by Schaefer and Olson (1981) for the development of the PAIR inventory yielded several differences. Schaefer and Olson's sample was a larger, older, less educated group. In addition, they had been married for a longer period of time than the sample used in this study. The findings of this study in terms of averages on the five perceived intimacy scales were significantly higher than those reported by Schaefer and Olson. The average score on the Conventionality Scale was also higher for this study sample than the one established for the development of the PAIR inventory.

One possible explanation for these differences, other than demographic characteristics, may lie in the nature of these different populations. The population from which this sample was selected was considered happily married based on DAS scores. The Schaefer and Olson sample, although reported happily married, consisted of participants of marital enrichment programs. Couples who participate in marital enrichment programs have been considered by some researchers (Powell & Wampler, 1982) to fall in the mid-range between clinical and happily married couples. Therefore, given the

strong relationship between marital quality and perceived intimacy it might be expected that perceived intimacy scores would be lower (as indeed they were) for the Schaefer and Olson sample than for the sample in this study.

One parallel explanation may be found by looking at the Conventionality Scales scores. This explanation is offered by Hansen (1981) in his study of the relationship between marital adjustment and conventionality. Hansen found that conventionality "makes a genuine, . . . contribution to marital adjustment scores" (p. 861-862). It can be inferred by comparing the results from the Conventionality Scale from this study with those from the Schaefer and Olson sample, that the Schaefer and Olson sample came from a population of lower marital quality and therefore obtained lower scores on perceived intimacy and conventionality than those found in this sample.

Another possible explanation for the differences in scores between this sample and the Schaefer and Olson sample may be the presence or absence of children. This study utilized childless couples while the Schaefer and Olson study does not mention this variable, therefore it is assumed that both childless couples and couples with children were included in the study. Several studies have demonstrated that there are significant differences between childless couples and couples with children (Feldman, 1981; Houseknecht, 1979; Ryder, 1973; Waldron & Routh, 1981). Higher scores on

perceived intimacy and conventionality may be one more difference between childless couples and parents.

Although the average scores on perceived intimacy were higher for this study than for the normative sample, they do follow the same trend of the Schaefer and Olson sample. Schaefer and Olson (1981) reported that perceived emotional intimacy, perceived intellectual intimacy, and perceived recreational intimacy had the highest correlations of all the intimacy scales when correlated with the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Test. A high correlation was identified between all five areas of perceived intimacy and the DAS in this study, with the three more powerful correlations being those of perceived emotional intimacy, perceived intellectual intimacy, and perceived recreational intimacy. These findings are congruent with those reported by the authors of the PAIR Schaefer and Olson.

Since Schaefer and Olson do not offer normative data for the expected intimacy scales, or for the differences between perceptions and expectations of intimacy, a comparison of findings in these areas can not be offered.

The sample for this study, on the other hand, seemed to be quite representative of childless couples. In addition to reporting higher levels of marital quality, more childless couples than parents tend to report lack of religious affiliation. Women in childless couples also tend to report higher levels of education and more involvement in the workforce than mothers.

These were all characteristics found in this study sample; therefore results from this study can best be generalized to happily married childless couples in general.

Findings in relation to the hypothesized relationships were quite congruent with the expected results, and they lend support to the theoretical and clinical notions of the importance of intimacy in marital relationships. More specifically they lend support primarily to a positive relationship between perceived intimacy and marital quality. Furthermore the findings suggested that there are differences between males and females in the manner they experience both perceptions and expectations of intimacy. Men tend to perceive their marital relationships as higher on levels of emotional intimacy than women, while women perceived higher levels of recreational intimacy than men. Although no other single measure of perceived intimacy resulted in differences between males and females, when perceived intimacy was combined to assess its contribution to marital quality, the best predictor of marital quality for males was the model composed of emotional intimacy, social intimacy, and recreational intimacy. On the other hand, female marital quality was best predicted from the model of perceived emotional intimacy, perceived intellectual intimacy, and perceived recreational intimacy.

Expectations of intimacy although significant in some areas do not appear to be a powerful predictor of marital quality. For men, expectations of intellectual intimacy and expectations of recreational intimacy were significant when analyzed individually; for females, all areas of expected intimacy except social intimacy, were significant when analyzed individually.

The expectation component of intimacy becomes especially significant when analyzed in terms of the gap between perceptions and expectations of intimacy. The differences between an individual's perception and expectation of intimacy resulted in an inverse relationship with marital quality in all five areas of intimacy. This means that as the discrepancy between an individual's perception and expectation of intimacy increased, marital quality decreased. These findings supported previous reports that low discrepancy between what an individual gets out of a relationship and what he/she would like to get out of the relationship is related to higher marital quality (Blishen et al., 1975; Rhyne, 1981; Young, 1982). Again, the differential findings suggested that males and females place different values on specific areas of intimacy. For males, the predictive value of the discrepancy model fell into two variables: emotional and social; while for females the predictive value of the discrepancy model fell in the same areas of the perceived model: emotional, intellectual, and recreational intimacy.

Since expected intimacy was not a powerful predictor of marital quality by itself, its participation along with perceived intimacy was assessed to find the global contribution of all intimacy variables to marital quality. This resulted in differences, again, between males and females. The most powerful predictor of marital quality for males, included two expected intimacy terms, and three perceived intimacy ones. Since both the perceived and expected social

intimacy term appeared in this model, a further analysis was executed entering into the model the perceived variables and the differential terms. This resulted in an equally powerful predictive model that included three perceived terms and the social differential term. This finding seems to corroborate that expected intimacy by itself is not a good predictor of marital quality, and that for males, perceived emotional intimacy, the discrepancy between expected and perceived social intimacy, perceived recreational intimacy, and perceived intellectual intimacy accounted for a very high portion of the variance in marital quality.

For females, when the total intimacy model was assessed, none of the expected intimacy terms made it into the model; but when the differential terms were combined with the perceived terms, two differential variables appeared as significant in the model. The perceived-differential model for females included perceived emotional intimacy, the difference between perception and expectation of recreational intimacy, perceived intellectual intimacy, and the difference between perception and expectation of social intimacy.

The overall conclusion from these findings was that, as postulated by both theorists and clinicians, intimacy is a powerful component of marital quality. High levels of perceived intimacy appeared to be strongly related to high levels of marital quality. Each area of intimacy did not participate equally in predicting marital quality. And, that although differences between perceptions and expectations of

intimacy are related to marital quality, the absolute levels of attained emotional, social, and recreational intimacy were better predictors of marital quality for males; while females marital quality was almost equally predicted from the levels of perceived emotional intimacy, perceived intellectual intimacy, and perceived recreational intimacy, than from the discrepancies between perceptions and expectations of intimacy in the same areas. These findings lend support to both theoretical and clinical notions previously discussed. That is, high level of marital quality is associated with perceptions of high levels of intimacy; and little discrepancy between perceptions and expectations of intimacy is equally associated with a satisfying marital relationship.

It was interesting that the sexual intimacy term did not enter into any of the predictive equations for marital quality either for males or for females. A better understanding of this exclusion may be arrived at by examining the relationship of combined scores on marital quality to the discrepancies between spouses in some areas of intimacy.

Although hypotheses four and five were not rejected, some very interesting findings emerged from testing these hypotheses. If those hypotheses had been postulated in terms of nonlinear relationships, they would have been rejected. When a quadratic term was entered into the model, the discrepancies between spouses in the areas of perceived emotional, sexual, and recreational intimacy, in the area of conventionality, and in the areas of expected emotional, sexual, and

recreational intimacy resulted significant although with low predictive power. Analyses of the plots of these equations seemed to indicate that the tendency was for males to perceive higher level of emotional intimacy than females; and that marital quality decreased as the discrepancy between spouses increased in this area. Furthermore as the discrepancy increased in the positive direction (males higher scores than females), the decline in marital quality increased sharply. The same appeared to be true of the discrepancy between spouses in terms of expected emotional intimacy. A mild discrepancy in the negative direction (husbands lower scores than wives) did not affect much of the reported marital quality of the couple, but when the discrepancy increased in the positive direction, marital quality decreased sharply.

The discrepancy between spouses in the area of perceived recreational intimacy, followed also a curvilinear relationship, as discrepancies increased in either direction, combined marital quality declined. More difficult to explain is the relationship between the discrepancy in expected recreational intimacy and combined marital quality. When the discrepancy was mild in either direction the previous established trend applied. Marital quality increased as the discrepancy decreased, but when the discrepancy was extreme in the negative direction it was somewhat confusing to make sense of the sharp increase in marital quality. It may very well be that the discrepancy was so extreme that the spouses

have compensated for that discrepancy in other areas; or since it is a very obvious area of discrepancy, it is acknowledged and accepted without influencing the quality of the relationship.

Couples discrepancy on conventionality scores, indicated that marital quality decreased as discrepancy in scores increased in either direction.

Finally, although neither perceived nor expected sexual intimacy appeared to influence marital quality when other areas of intimacy were taken in consideration, an interesting finding emerged from comparing the couples' combined scores on the DAS with their discrepancy in sexual intimacy with the nonlinear approach. Both in the areas of perceived and expected sexual intimacy the same trend emerged. Marital quality decreased as discrepancy between spouses increased; but furthermore, when husbands perceived their relationships as providing significant higher levels of sexual intimacy than those perceived by their wives, the tendency was for a sharp decrease in marital quality. In the area of expected sexual intimacy, discrepancy in expected sexual intimacy did not exert a significant influence on marital quality if wives expected higher levels of sexual intimacy than their husbands. On the other hand, discrepancy in expected sexual intimacy decreased marital quality if husbands expected significant higher levels of sexual intimacy than their wives.

Since couples participating in this study tended to be happily married, the largest number of discrepancy observations were very close to zero; and there were very few extreme observations therefore the above findings in relation to discrepancy scores between spouses need to be very cautiously interpreted.

In summary, findings from this study support both clinical and theoretical notions postulating that a relationship exists between marital quality and intimacy. Furthermore it appears that intimacy accounts for almost all of the variance in the marital quality of childless couples.

This study also helps to clarify the controversy of the importance of an absolute level of intimacy over relative similarities between the individual's perceptions and expectations of intimacy. Both absolute levels of intimacy, and similarity between perceptions and expectations are predictive of marital quality; although with different predictive power for males and females. Findings also supported that males and females perceived and expected intimacy differently, and identified different perdictive models for each sex group.

Finally, combining couples scores helped to identify the specific influence of discrepancies between spouses in the different areas of intimacy and how these discrepancies affect marital quality, but these findings are to be taken cautiously given the limited degree of discrepancy observed in this sample.

Conclusions

This study sought to investigate the relationship between ratings on marital quality and ratings on intimacy in childless couples. This relationship had been identified by theorists and clinicians, but had not received empirical validation. Findings from this study validated such relationship.

Five areas of intimacy were studied each yielding two types of scores: perceived and expected. These scores were individually correlated with scores on marital quality, and they yielded significant results. Furthermore, combined inclusion of intimacy in several predictive models resulted in different models for males and females, and with different predictive power.

There were two models that powerfully predicted marital quality for males. One included the variables of perceived emotional intimacy, perceived social intimacy, expected intellectual intimacy, and perceived recreational intimacy. This model accounted for 77% of the variance in the marital quality of men. The other equally powerful model was composed of perceived emotional intimacy, the discrepancy between expected and perceived social intimacy, perceived recreational intimacy, and perceived intellectual intimacy. This model accounted for 76% of the variance in marital quality for men. Two other models were identified that predicted marital quality for men, although not as powerful predictors as the previous two. The model that included

perceived emotional intimacy, perceived social intimacy, and perceived recreational intimacy accounted for 71% of the variance in marital quality, while the differential model, composed of the discrepancies between expectations and perceptions of intimacy in the emotional, and social areas accounted for 59% of the variance in men's marital quality.

There were four different models identified that can equally predict female marital quality. The first model included the variables of perceived emotional intimacy, perceived recreational intimacy, and conventionality. This model accounted for 80% of the variance in female marital quality, and was the most parsimonious of all models. The second model also accounted for 80% of the variance in marital quality and included four terms: Perceived emotional intimacy, perceived intellectual intimacy, the discrepancy between expected and perceived social intimacy, and the discrepancy between expected and perceived recreational intimacy. A third powerful model to predict marital quality in females was the one with three perceived intimacy variables: Emotional, intellectual, and recreational. This model accounted for 77% of the variance in women's marital quality. Finally, the differential model resulted in 74% of the variance in marital quality for women and included the discrepancies between perceptions and expectations of intimacy in the emotional, intellectual, and recreational areas.

Although results from male and female models are all significant and powerful predictors of marital quality, more variance in marital quality can be explained from the female models than from the male models. Moreover, results from the analyses of data from the female subsample lend equal support to postulated notions emphasizing the absolute value of intimacy, as well as to the relative value of intimacy; while results from the male subsample lend stronger support to the absolute value than to the relative value of intimacy.

Other important conclusions obtained from this study were (1) happily married couples tend to have similar perceptions and expectations of intimacy; therefore their discrepancies were very close to zero. (2) Sexual intimacy did not contribute to marital quality beyond the contribution of the other four intimacy variables in the PAIR inventory. (3) Perceived emotional intimacy was the single most powerful predictor of marital quality for both males and females.

Recommendations

The relationships obtained between scores on the DAS and scores on the PAIR inventory variables are so powerful that they raise the question as to whether these two inventories may be tapping the same dimension. Certainly, Schaefer and Olson (1981) have argued that the PAIR inventory is not a global measure of marital quality, and Spanier (1976) has suggested that the DAS was composed of four empirically verified components that encompassed marital quality.

Yet these four components may be closely linked to intimacy. Research studies assessing the common factor variance in these two inventories may clarify this issue.

Some other issues raised by this study relate to sample selection. It would be important to utilize populations experiencing lower levels of marital quality in order to validate the findings from this study. In addition, in order to know whether these findings apply to all couples or just to happily married childless couples, research replicating this study with couples with children, cohabiting couples, clinical couples, or same sex couples is strongly recommended.

Another question raised by this study refers to the possible manipulation of intimacy to increase marital quality. Before recommending that specific intimacy skills be taught, it is important to ascertain if these results hold true under experimental or quasi-experimental conditions. If intimacy can be manipulated to effect changes in marital quality under experimental conditions, then these results could be utilized to recommend specific training programs in intimacy prior to becoming involved in a marital relationship. Pre-marital counseling that involved intimacy training could become a significant step towards developing and maintaining happy marital relationships.

In summary, this study investigated the relationship between marital quality and intimacy in childless couples. Results suggested a significant relationship between marital quality and intimacy and identified perceived emotional intimacy as the single most poweful predictor of marital quality. Moreover, several models were identified to predict marital quality based on intimacy scores. These models differed for males and for females. Recommendations were offered for future research.

APPENDIX A
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Your participation is being requested for completing two inventories and a personal information sheet. There are no right or wrong answers. The purpose of this study is to obtain information on the relationship between intimacy and the marital relationship. It is not expected that you will be at risk. However, you may gain some new information about your marital relationship if you decide to request some feedback based on your and your mate's responses to the inventories after the study is completed. Your responses will be kept confidential within legal limits, and they will be used solely for research purposes. No monetary compensation will be awarded.

If you have any questions concerning this study after you completed your responses, please feel free to contact me at 378-5349. You may withdraw your consent to participate in this project without any prejudice to you. Please read the following statement and sign your name in the appropriate place.

detach and keep
---
detach and return

"I have read and I understand the procedure described above. I agree to participate in the study and I have received a copy of this description."

_____ _____

Participant Date

Researcher: Andres Nazario, Jr., 1208 NW 23rd Avenue, Gainesville, FL 32605

APPENDIX B
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Couple # _____ Sex _____ Age _____

Relationship Status:
____ Married
____ Cohabiting
____ Divorced/Remarried
____ Divorced/Cohabiting
____ Other (Specify)

Length of Relationship:
_____ Years
_____ Years
_____ Years
_____ Years
_____ Years

Occupation: _____

Number of years of school completed: _____

Religious affiliation: _____

Number of children from previous relationship(s): _____

Number of children from present relationship: _____

Number of adopted children: _____

If you do not have any children, which of the following statements apply to you?

_____ I am currently postponing having children
_____ I am unsure about wanting to have children
_____ I would like to have children but my spouse does not want to
_____ I am physically unable to have children
_____ I do not want to have children
_____ Other (please specify)

Race/Ethnicity: __ White __ Black __ Hispanic __ Asian __ Other

Have you ever been involved in marital counseling/therapy?
Yes __ No __

Are you presently involved in marital counseling/therapy?
Yes __ No __

If you had marital difficulties would you consider marital counseling/therapy:
___ Definitely No
___ Only if the situation is extreme
___ Probably
____ Not sure
____ Certainly yes

REFERENCES

Ackerman, N. W. The Psychodynamics of Family Life. New York: Basic Books, Inc. Publishers, 1958.

Adams, C. R. Marital Happiness Prediction Inventory. University Park, Pennsylvania: Division of Marriage and Family Service, 1960.

Altman, I. & Taylor, D. A. Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationship. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.

Angyal, A. Neurosis and Treatment: A Holistic Theory. New York: John Wiley, 1965.

Bellings, A. Conflict resolution in distressed and nondistressed married couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1979, 47, 368-376.

Blishen, B. R., Greer-Wootten, B., and Ornstein, M. D. Social Change in Canada: Trends in Attitudes, Values and Perceptions. Unpublished manuscript, 1975, York University, Toronto.

Bowen, M. Theory in the practice of psychotherapy. In P. J. Guerin (Ed.) Family Therapy: Theory and Practice. New York: Gardner Press, 1976.

Burgess, E. W. & Cottrell, L. S. Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1939.

Burgess, E. W. & Wallin, P. Engagement and Marriage. Philadelphia: J. P. Lippincott Company, 1953.

Burr, W. R. Satisfaction with various aspects of marriage over the life cycle. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 29-37.

Burr, W. R. Theory Construction and the Sociology of the Family. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Burr, W. R., Leigh, G. K., Day, R. D., and Constantine, J. Symbolic interaction and the family. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, and I. L. Reiss (Eds.) Contemporary Theories about the Family (Vol. 2). New York: The Free Press, 1979.

Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., and Rodgers, W. L. The Quality of American Life: Evaluations and atisfactions. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.

Clinebell, H. J. & Clinebell, C. H. The Intimate Marriage. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Cox, F. D. Human Intimacy: Marriage, the Family and its Meaning. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1978.

Dahms, A. Emotional Intimacy. Denver, Colorado: Pruett, 1972.

Davidson, B., Balswick, J., and Halverson, C. Affective self-disclosure and marital adjustment: A test of equity theory. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1983, 45(1), 93-102.

Davis, E. C., Hovestadt, A. J., Piercy, F. P., and Cochran, S. W. Effects of weekend and weekly marriage enrichment program formats. Family Relations, 1982, 31(1), 85-90.

Davis, M. S. Intimate Relations. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

DeBurger, R. Marriage Today: Problems, Issues and Alternatives. Cambridge, Massachuetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1977.

Denes, M. Existential approaches to intimacy. In M. Fisher & G. Stricker (Eds.) Intimacy. New York: Plenum Press, 1982.

Edmonds, V. H. Marital conventionalization: Definition and measurement. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29, 681-688.

Edmonds, V. H., Withers, G., and Dibatista, D. Adjustment, conservatism and marital conventionalization. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 96-103.

Epstein, N. B. & Santa-Barbara, J. Conflict behavior in clinical couples: Interpersonal perceptions and stable outcomes. Family Process, 1975, 14, 51-60.

Erickson, E. Childhood and Society (2nd ed.). New York: Norton, 1963.

Eshleman, J. R. & Clarke, J. H. Intimacy, Commitments, and Marriage: Developments in Relationships. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.

Farson, R. Why good marriages fail. In J. E. DeBurger (Ed.) Marriage Today: Problems, Issues and Alternatives. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1977.

Feldman, L. Marital conflict and marital intimacy: An integrative psychodynamic-behavioral-systemic model. Family Process, 1979, 18, 69-78.

Fisher, M. & Stricker, G. Intimacy. New York: Plenum Press, 1982.

Fitzpatrick, M. & Best, P. Dyadic adjustment in relational types: Consensus, cohesion, affectional expression, and satisfaction in enduring relationships. Communication Monographs, 1979, 46, 167-178.

Frankel, B. Intimacy and cojoint marital therapy. In M. Fisher & G. Striker (Eds.) Intimacy. New York: Plenum Press, 1982.

Fromm, E. Man for Himself. New York: Rinehart, 1947.

Glenn, N. D. Psychological well-being in the postparental stage: Some evidence from national surveys. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1975, 37, 105-110.

Glenn, N. D. & McLanahan, S. Children and marital happiness: A further specification of the relationship. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1982, 44(1), 63-72.

Gottman,J. Marital Interaction. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Grunebaum, H. & Christ, J. (Eds.) Contemporary Marriage, Structure, Dynamics and Therapy. Boston: Little & Brown, 1976.

Hamilton, G. V. A Research in Marriage. New York: Albert & Charles Boni, 1929.

Hanes, J. & Waring, E. M. Marital Intimacy and Nonpsychotic Emotional Illness. Unpublished manuscript, 1979, School of Medicine, University of South Carolina, Columbia.

Hansen, G. L. Marital adjustment and conventionalization: A reexamination. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1981, 43(4), 855-863.

Hatfield, E. Passionate love, companionate love, and intimacy. In M. Fisher & G. Stricker (Eds.) Intimacy. New York: Plenum Press, 1982.

Hatfield, E., Utne, M. K., and Traupmann, J. Equity theory and intimate relationships. In R. L. Burgess & T. L. Huston (Eds.) Social Exchange in Developing Relationships. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Hawkins, J. L. the Locke Marital Adjustment Test of social desirability. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1966, 28, 193-195.

Hicks, M. & Platt, M. Marital happiness and stability: A review of research in the sixties. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 553-574.

Hoffman, L. Foundations of Family Therapy. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1981.

Horowitz, J. E. The relationship among marital adjustment, sexual satisfaction and adjustment, and communication. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 1977.

Houseknecht, S. K. Childlessness and marital adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1979, 41(2), 259-265.

Houseknecht, S. K. & Macke, A. S. Combining marriage and career: The marital adjustment of professional women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1981, 43(3), 651-661.

Huesmann, L. R. & Levinger, G. Incremental exchange theory: A formal model for progression in dyadic social interaction. In L. Berkowitz & E. Walster (Eds.) Equity Theory: Toward a General Theory of Social Interaction. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Inselberg, R. M. The sentence completion technique in the measure of marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1964, 26, 339-341.

Jourard, S. M. The Transparent Self. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1964.

Katz, M. Agreement on connotative meaning in marriage. Family Process, 1965, 4, 64-74.

Kotlar, S. L. Middle-class role perceptions and marital adjustment. Sociological and Social Research, 1965, 49(3), 283-293.

Ladner, J. Intimacy and sex therapy. In M. Fisher & G. Stricker (Eds.) Intimacy. New York: Plenum Press, 1982.

Lee, M. L. The relationship among communication, marital adjustment, and the dimension of caring. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida, 1980.

Levenson, E. Changing concepts of intimacy in psychoanalytic practice. Contemporary Psychoanalysis, 1974, 10, 359-371.

Levinger, G. Task and social behavior in marriage. Sociometry, 1964, 24(4), 433-448.

Levinger, G. & Raush, H. Close Relationships. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1977.

Lewis, R. A. & Spanier, G. B. Theorizing about the quality and stability of marriage. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, and I. L. Reiss (Eds.) Contemporary Theories about the Family (Vol. 2). New York: The Free Press, 1979.

Locke, H. J. Predicting Adjustment in Marriage: A Comparison of a Divorced and Happily Married Group. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1951.

Locke, H. J. & Wallace, K. M. Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 1959, 21, 251-255.

Mahrer, A. R. Humanistic approaches to intimacy. In M. Fisher & G. Stricker (Eds.) Intimacy. New York: Plenum Press, 1982.

Manson, M. P. & Lerner, A. The Marriage Adjustment Sentence Completion Survey Manual. Beverly Hills, California: Western Psychological Services, 1962.

Martin, P. A. A Marital Therapy Manual. New York: Brunner/Mazel Publishers, 1976.

Maslow, A. H. Toward a Psychology of Being (2nd ed.). Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1968.

McRoy, S. & Fisher, V. L. Marital adjustment of graduate student couples. Family Relations, 1982, 31(1), 37-41.

Mendelsohn, R. Intimacy in psychoanalysis. In M. Fisher & G. Stricker (Eds.) Intimacy. New York: Plenum Press, 1982.

Navran, L. Communication and adjustment in marriage. Family Process, 1967, 6, 173-184.

Neill, J. R. & Kniskern, D. P. (Eds.) From Psyche to Systems: The Evolving Therapy of Carl Whitaker. New York: The Guilford Press, 1982.

O'Brien, P. R. Interpersonal perceptual congruency and communication in the marital dyad. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 1976.

Olson, D. H. Intimacy and the aging family. Realities of Aging. St. Paul, Minnesota: Univerity of Minnesota Press, 1975.

Powell, G. S. & Wampler, K. W. Marriage enrichment participants: Levels of marital satisfaction. Family Relations, 1982, 31, 389-393.

Ramey, J. W. Intimate Friendships. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.

Rhyne, D. Bases of marital satisfaction among men and women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1981, 43(4), 941-955.

Ryder, R. G. Longitudinal data relating marriage satisfaction and having a child. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 35, 604-607.

Sager, C. J. & Hunt, B. Intimate Partners. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979.

Schaefer, M. T. & Olson, D. H. Assessing intimacy: The PAIR inventory. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 1981, 7(1), 47-60.

Sexton, R. E. & Sexton, V. S. Intimacy: A historical perspective. In M. Fisher & G. Stricker (Eds.) Intimacy. New York: Plenum Press, 1982.

Shor, J. & Sanville, J. Illusion in Loving. Los Angeles: Double Helix Press, 1978.

Simms, S. Androgyny of husbands and wives and marital satisfaction and communication. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 1978.

Snyder, D. Multidimensional assessment of marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1979, 41(4), 813-823.

Spanier, G. B. Further evidence on methodological weakness in the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale and other measures of adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34(3), 403-404.

Spanier, G. B. Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scale for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38, 15-27.

Spanier, G. B. The measurement of marital quality. Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 1979, 5, 288-300.

Spanier, G. B. & Cole, C. L. Toward clarification and investigation of marital adjustment. International Journal of the Sociology of the Family, 1976, 6, 121-146.

Spanier, G. B. & Furstenberg, F. F. Jr. Remarriage after divorce: A longitudinal analysis of well-being. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1982, 44(3), 709-720.

Spanier, G. B. & Lewis, R. A. Marital quality: A review of the seventies. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 1980, 42(4), 96-110.

Spanier, G. B. & Thompson, L. A confirmatory analysis of the Dyadic Adjustment Scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1982, 44(3), 731-738.

Steiner, L. R. Romantic Marriage. Philadelphia: Chitlon Books, 1963.

Strauss, E. S. Couple in love. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Massachusetts, Boston Massachusetts, 1974.

Sullivan, H. S. The Interpersonal Theory of Psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1953.

Taylor, A. B. Role perception, empathy and marital adjustment. Sociology and Social Research, 1967, 52, 22-34.

Terman, L. M. Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill Books Co., 1938.

Thompson, L. & Spanier, G. B. The end of marriage and the acceptance of marital termination. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1983, 45, 103-107.

U.S. Department of Labor. Dictionary of Occupational Titles. (3rd. Ed.). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965.

Waldron, H. & Routh, D. K. The effect of the first child on the marital relationship. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1981, 43(4), 785-788.

Whitaker, C. Functions of marriage. In J. R. Neill & D. P. Kniskern (Eds.) From Psyche to Systems: The Evolving Therapy of Carl Whitaker. New York: The Guilford Press, 1982.

Young, V. The relationship between marital satisfaction and child adjustment. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 1982.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Andres Nazario, Jr., was born in Zaza del Medio, Las Villas, Cuba. He came to the United States as a political exile. After several years away from school he began to pursue a career in psychology. He obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree in psychology at Florida International University in 1975, and immediately began working as a social worker for the Dade County Department of Youth and Family Development. While with Dade County, Mr. Nazario began to specialize in the area of marriage and family therapy and continued pursuing his career goals at FIU where he was awarded a Master of Science degree in school psychology in 1977. Mr. Nazario entered the counseling psychology doctoral program at the University of Florida in 1979 and was awarded a Minority Fellowship that year. Mr. Nazario completed an internship in counseling psychology at the University of Florida Psychological and Vocational Counseling Center in 1982. He was awarded a Ph.D. in counseling psychology in 1983. Dr. Nazario is a clinical member of the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy. He is licensed by the State of Florida as a Marriage and Family Therapist. Dr. Nazario is co-director of the Gainesville Family Institute in Gainesville, Florida.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Ellen S. Amatea, Chairperson
Assistant Professor of
Counselor Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Harry A. Grater, Jr.
Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Stephen F. Olejnik
Associate Professor of
Foundations of Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Paul G. Schauble
Professor of Psychology

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Counseling Psychology in the College of Education and to the Graduate School, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

December, 1983

Dean for Graduate Studies and Research